VOL 19 No 11 NOVEMBER 1989

SURVEY of Current Affairs

Government and Administration

Ministerial Changes 403

Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference 404

Guildford Pub Bombings: Convictions Quashed 405

Computer Misuse 406

Shorter Note
Executive Agencies 407

External Affairs and Defence

European Economic and Monetary Union 408

Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting 409

British-Argentine Relations 422

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Chancellor's Mansion House Speech 424

Unofficial Industrial Action 425

Railway Safety 426

The Global Environment 427

Shorter Notes
Multi-Fibre Arrangement 430 British Shipbuilders 430
Food Safety 430; Forestry 431;
Fast Reactor Programme 431;
Renewable Sources of Energy 431;
Manchester Metrolink 432;
Horticultural Research and Development 432;
Coastal Bathing Waters 433

Social and Cultural Affairs

International Action against the Illicit Drugs Trade 434

Social Security Benefits 434

Shorter Note
Endangered Species: The African Elephant 438

Documentation 439

The *Survey of Current Affairs* is produced primarily for use overseas, but in response to requests has also been made available in Britain. Subscription and distribution inquiries should be addressed to HMSO Books, P.O. Box 276, London SW8 5DT, and editorial inquiries to Reference Services, Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7DU. Although the material is Crown Copyright, it may be reproduced without special permission.
Other documents produced by Reference Services, if not on sale through Her Majesty's Stationery Office, may be obtained direct from the Overseas Distribution Unit, Central Office of Information, at the above address on payment of a small charge.

NOTE

The term 'Britain' is used informally in the *Survey of Current Affairs* to mean the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. 'Great Britain' comprises England, Wales and Scotland.

Ministerial Changes

Several ministerial changes were announced by the Prime Minister's Office in late October and early November following the resignation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Rt Hon Nigel Lawson, MP.

The new appointments to the Cabinet are as follows:

Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
Rt Hon Douglas Hurd, CBE, MP (former Secretary of State for the Home Department)

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt Hon John Major, MP (former Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs)

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt Hon David Waddington, QC, MP (former Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury – Government Chief Whip)

Other appointments, including some made in September, are:

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Minister of State
The Baroness Trumpington (former Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food)

Department of the Environment
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
Mr David Heathcoat-Amory, MP (former Lord Commissioner of the Treasury – a Government Whip in the House of Commons)

Department of Health
Minister of State
Mrs Virginia Bottomley, MP (former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of the Environment)

Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
The Baroness Hooper

Home Office
Minister of State
Mr David Mellor, QC, MP (former Minister of State, Department of Health)

HM Treasury
Parliamentary Secretary (Government Chief Whip)
Rt Hon Timothy Renton, MP (former Minister of State, Home Office)

Lord Commissioner of the Treasury (Government Whip in the House of Commons)
Hon Tom Sackville, MP (former Assistant Whip)

Assistant Government Whip in the House of Commons
Mr Nicholas Baker, MP

The Rt Hon Nigel Lawson, MP (former Chancellor of the Exchequer), tendered his resignation from the Government on 26 October.

Mr Timothy Renton, MP, has been appointed to the Privy Council.

Baroness Trumpington was promoted from Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State at the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food on 28 September. Under the new division of ministerial responsibilities in the Ministry, she has been designated Minister for the Countryside, while the Parliamentary Secretaries, Mr David Curry, MP, and Mr David Maclean, MP, have been designated Minister for Farming, Fisheries and the Food Industry and Minister for Food Safety, respectively. A new Food Safety Directorate has been established within the Ministry (see pp 430-1).

Baroness Hooper was appointed Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Health on 28 September following the death on 16 September of Lord Trafford, who had been Minister of State in that Department since July.

An announcement about a further appointment to the Government Whips office in the House of Lords will be made in due course.

With 22 members, the size of the Cabinet remains unchanged.

THE CABINET

Following the new appointments, the composition of the Cabinet is as follows:

Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury and Minister for the Civil Service
Rt Hon Margaret Thatcher, FRS, MP

Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons
Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Howe, QC, MP

Lord Chancellor
Rt Hon The Lord Mackay of Clashfern

Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
Rt Hon Douglas Hurd, CBE, MP

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt Hon John Major, MP

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt Hon David Waddington, QC, MP

Secretary of State for Wales
Rt Hon Peter Walker, MBE, MP

Secretary of State for Employment
Rt Hon Norman Fowler, MP

Secretary of State for Defence
Rt Hon Tom King, MP

Secretary of State for Trade and Industry
Rt Hon Nicholas Ridley, MP

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt Hon Kenneth Baker, MP

Secretary of State for Health
Rt Hon Kenneth Clarke, QC, MP

Secretary of State for Education and Science
Rt Hon John MacGregor, OBE, MP

Secretary of State for Scotland
Rt Hon Malcolm Rifkind, QC, MP

Secretary of State for Transport
Rt Hon Cecil Parkinson, MP

Secretary of State for Energy
Rt Hon John Wakeham, MP

Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House of Lords
Rt Hon The Lord Belstead

Secretary of State for Social Security
Rt Hon Antony Newton, OBE, MP

Secretary of State for the Environment
Rt Hon Christopher Patten, MP

Secretary of State for Northern Ireland
Rt Hon Peter Brooke, MP

Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Rt Hon John Selwyn Gummer, MP

Chief Secretary to the Treasury
Rt Hon Norman Lamont, MP

For a full list of government ministers, see COI reference paper *United Kingdom Government Ministers, No 61/89/2.*

Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference

Discussions on a range of issues relating to confidence in the Northern Ireland security services and the system of justice have taken place within the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference.

Following a number of recent allegations that confidential information held by the security services in Northern Ireland has been leaked to terrorist groups, an inquiry was set up in September by the Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), Mr Hugh Annesley. A team of police officers from outside Northern Ireland, headed by the Cambridgeshire Deputy Chief Constable, Mr John Stevens, was asked to conduct a full and thorough investigation into the allegations.

Issues arising from these events have been the subject of discussion at three meetings of the Intergovernmental Conference, established under the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement (see pp 219-21). At the latest meeting, held in Belfast on 18 October, Britain was represented by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr Peter Brooke, and the Irish Republic by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Gerard Collins. Also present were the Minister of State at the Northern Ireland Office, Mr John Cope, the Irish Minister for Justice, Mr Ray Burke, and the heads of the RUC and the Garda.

Joint Statement

Following the meeting, a joint statement by both Governments said that their discussions on confidence in the Northern Ireland security services and the system of justice there had been 'constructive and worthwhile' and had enabled 'each side to set out clearly its views and concerns'.

The statement said that confidence in the impartiality and integrity of the security forces was critically important for their common objectives. It emphasised that 'any collusion between members of the security forces and paramilitaries is an issue of the utmost gravity . . . and requires urgent action to allay public concern and to demonstrate that no departure from the rule of law by any member of the security forces will be tolerated'. The disciplinary aspects of all such cases 'would be dealt with on the principle that there could be no place in the security forces for those who betrayed their trust'.

British Action

The joint statement set out the action taken by the British Government in response to recent events:

1 The investigation by Mr John Stevens, which was 'being conducted both rigorously and promptly, with a view to the earliest possible comprehensive report'.

2 The introduction of new safeguards on the handling of security material, such as photo-montages; it was now an offence to retain such documents without authority and all serving personnel were required to surrender any such material. These new rules applied to members of the armed forces who were serving or had served for an appreciable period in Northern Ireland.

3 Improvements to the process of screening new recruits to the Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR) and transferees from other Army units, and for follow-up action such as re-vetting. Among the new measures was the establishment of a special unit for screening in the UDR, manned by the regular Army. In the British Government's view, any form of association between members of illegal paramilitary organisations, of whatever persuasion, or other association incompatible with membership of the security forces was totally unacceptable.

Official Working Group

Both Governments agreed to set up a working group of officials to make early recommendations to develop further the policy of ensuring as rapidly as possible that there should be a police presence in all operations involving direct contact between the armed forces and the community. The British side emphasised that in their operations the security forces would at all times take account of their relationship with the community.

The Irish side stressed that the events under discussion had raised general issues going beyond individual cases. The Irish Government believed that the widespread concern raised by these issues could best be met by a comprehensive enquiry into the relations between the security forces, in particular the UDR, and the community. It was its intention to return to this proposal at a later conference. For its part the British Government disagreed with this analysis of the problem.

Both Governments confirmed 'their determination to continue their close co-operation under the Agreement to combat terrorism from whichever side of the community it may come'.

Other Matters

The British side expressed its disappointment that it had not proved possible to prosecute Mr Patrick Ryan (see pp 7-8). In response, the Irish side said that the Republic's Director of Public Prosecutions had stated that material made available to him had not been sufficient to justify a prosecution.

Irish ministers raised the question of the Guildford Four and welcomed the terms of the statement made by the British Director of Public Prosecutions; they also set out their views on the implications for other cases, in particular the Maguire family (see fn p 406), and the six people convicted of the bombings in Birmingham in 1974.[1]

[1]In November 1976, bombs exploded in two public houses in Birmingham, killing 21 people and injuring 171. Six people from Northern Ireland were subsequently convicted of the murders. In January 1987 the Home Secretary referred the case to the Court of Appeal for it to consider new evidence. The Court confirmed the original convictions.

Guildford Pub Bombings: Convictions Quashed

Following the recent decision of the Court of Appeal to quash the conviction of four people for murder and other offences connected with the bombing of two public houses in Guildford in 1974, the Government has set up a judicial inquiry into the circumstances leading to the convictions.

Background

Two public houses were bombed in Guildford on 5 October 1974 as part of the Provisional IRA's campaign of terrorism; five people were killed and many others injured. Another public house was bombed in Woolwich on 7 November where two more people were killed.

In October 1975 Mr Patrick Armstrong, Mr Gerard Conlon, Mr Paul Hill and Miss Carole Richardson were convicted of murder and other offences related to the Guildford bombings on the basis of confessions made to the police; they were sentenced to life imprisonment. In addition, Mr Armstrong and Mr Hill were convicted of the murders in Woolwich. In October 1977, after a hearing lasting 11 days, the Court of Appeal refused applications by all four for leave to appeal.

In 1987 the then Home Secretary, Mr Douglas Hurd, responding to a number of representations made by Cardinal Basil Hume, Lord Devlin (a former judge), and two former Home Secretaries (Mr Merlyn Rees and Lord Jenkins of Hillhead) about the case, asked the Chief Constable of the Avon and Somerset police force to conduct certain investigations into it. In the light of these police enquiries, Mr Hurd decided on 16 January 1989 to refer the whole case to the Court of Appeal.

Following the reference to the Court of Appeal, subsequent examination of documents and records by the Avon and Somerset police uncovered evidence that led the Crown to take the view that misleading evidence had been given by officers of the Surrey police force at the 1975 trial. On 17 October the Crown Prosecution Service said that 'circumstances have recently come to the notice of the Director of Public Prosecutions which have caused him to conclude that it would be wrong for the Crown to seek to sustain the convictions'.

On 19 October the Court of Appeal quashed the convictions and three of the defendants were released; the fourth, Mr Paul Hill, was returned to Northern Ireland to continue serving a life sentence for murder, to which he was sentenced separately in June 1975. On 20 October he was released on bail pending an appeal hearing into this conviction.

In an official statement the Government of the Irish Republic welcomed the steps taken by the Crown Prosecution Service.

Home Secretary's Statement

Speaking in the House of Commons on 19 October (*Hansard*, Vol 158, No 156, Cols 271-85), Mr Hurd said that he had referred the case to the Court of Appeal because of representations alleging that a miscarriage of justice had occurred and putting forward matters that had not previously been considered by the courts.

Following subsequent enquiries by the Avon and Somerset police the Crown had taken the view that misleading evidence had been given by Surrey police officers at the trial and that this was sufficient to undermine the reliability of the confession evidence on which the convictions had been based. Notes of interviews with Mr Patrick Armstrong had indicated that a record presented in court at the original trial could not have been the contemporaneous record which it had been claimed to be by a number of police officers. It appeared, said Mr Hurd, that officers had given misleading evidence about circumstances in which they had obtained information from Mr Hill after he had been charged. Detention records had also shown serious inconsistencies. None of these matters had been known to the then Director of Public Prosecutions or to the prosecuting counsel at the trial.

Noting that separate confessions were made by Mr Armstrong and Mr Hill to Metropolitan police officers investigating the Woolwich incident, Mr Hurd said that these confessions were made following interviews by Surrey police officers, in which initial confessions to involvement in the Woolwich bombing had been recorded, in Guildford police station. In these circumstances the Crown had concluded that the factors undermining the reliability of the confessions recorded by certain Surrey police officers also applied to the authority of the confessions repeated in the same police station to the Metropolitan police officers.

Mr Hurd said that the Director of Public Prosecutions had initiated a criminal investigation to determine whether there was sufficient evidence to justify prosecuting the police officers concerned; of the three who were still in the police service, the Surrey Chief Constable had suspended two and the third was at present in hospital.

The Government had decided to establish a judicial enquiry into the circumstances leading up to the trial, to be presided over by Sir John May, a former Lord Justice of Appeal. Because it had been claimed that statements made to the Surrey police by two of the four had led the police to the Maguire family, who had been convicted of possessing explosives at a trial in March 1976, the enquiry would also look into the circumstances leading to their trial.[1]

Mr Hurd said that, since the Court of Appeal had quashed the convictions on the basis of newly discovered facts, the four people would be eligible to apply for compensation, the amount of which would be determined by an independent assessor.

On the question of uncorroborated evidence, Mr Hurd observed that the Scottish criminal law imposed a general requirement that evidence should be corroborated before it could be used to convict anybody. In English law this requirement could be met by the account of police officers present during an interview. The Government was not dismissing suggestions that there should be an independent review of English law in this respect but it would be sensible to have regard to the conclusions of Sir John May as the debate got under way again.

Concluding, Mr Hurd said: 'There has been a serious miscarriage of justice, which has resulted in wrongful imprisonment for many years. Even though that wrongful conviction has now been righted as a result of police investigations and the decision of the Court of Appeal, we must all feel anxiety, regret and deep concern at what has occurred.'

[1]In March 1976 Mr Patrick Maguire, Mrs Anne Maguire, their sons, Vincent and Patrick Maguire, Mr Patrick Conlon, Mr Patrick O'Neill and Mr Sean Smith were convicted on charges of possessing explosives. They have served their sentences and have been released, with exception of Mr Patrick Conlon, who died while in prison.

Computer Misuse

The Government has welcomed a report, prepared by the Law Commission, recommending the introduction of three new criminal offences to curb computer misuse.

Commenting on the report on 10 October, the Trade and Industry Secretary, Mr Nicholas Ridley, said that the Law Commission[1] was to be congratulated on an excellent report,[2] which set out clearly the case for new legislation in certain areas. 'The Government consider that legislation should be brought forward when a suitable opportunity arises.' It would take into account comments of all interested parties on the detailed proposals.

Law Commission's Proposals

The report concludes that two main problems are not at present properly covered by the criminal law: namely, the cost, disruption and uncertainty caused to the owners and users of computer systems by 'hacking' (the unauthorised entry into such systems or attempts to make such entry); and the loss and damage caused by unauthorised alterations to computer-held data or programs.

The Commission therefore recommends the creation of three completely new criminal offences:

1 A basic offence of unauthorised entry into a computer system, which would apply to anyone seeking to enter a computer, whether for fun or in order to try to interfere with the computer's working. This would be a summary offence triable in a magistrates' court and punishable with a maximum of three months' imprisonment.

2 A more serious offence of unauthorised entry into a computer system with intent to commit, or to assist the commission of, a serious crime. This offence would apply to, for instance, a person entering, or attempting to enter, the computer system of a bank or financial institution with a view to using the computer to divert funds to himself or herself. The maximum penalty for this offence would be five years' imprisonment.

3 A further serious offence of intentionally, and without authority, altering computer data or pro-

[1]The Law Commission was set up in 1965 to keep the law under review; much of its work is done under programmes approved by the Lord Chancellor, to whom the Commission's proposals for law reform are submitted.

[2]*Criminal Law: Computer Misuse.* Cm 819. HMSO, £5·60. ISBN 0 10 108192 8.

grams. This offence would cover the use of viruses and would include both attacks on a particular computer and the putting into circulation of infected disks that could eventually cause unauthorised alterations to computer material elsewhere. The maximum penalty for this offence would be five years' imprisonment.

On the question of the use of computers in cases of fraud, the report says that the Commission is studying further the question of whether the law should be changed to make criminal the obtaining of services by the deception of a computer or other machine.

Shorter Note

EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

A White Paper published on 30 October notes that ten executive agencies have been launched and that a further 40 government activities have been identified as candidates for agency status under the Government's Next Steps initiative, which aims to bring about lasting improvements in the quality and efficiency of government services (see pp 302-3). A total of 7,700 staff are employed by the ten agencies already established, while the 40 agency candidates have a combined workforce of almost 187,000. It is expected that at least another ten agencies will have been set up by summer 1990. The Government is continuing to look for other areas of its activities which could be carried out by agencies. Improved responsiveness to customer needs would be a prime test for gauging the success of the initiative.

The White Paper emphasises the need to maintain the momentum of the Next Steps programme while pointing out that each agency is different and must be given a suitable operating framework. This should include a clear definition of respective responsibilities and performance targets for quality of service and efficiency as well as appropriate delegation of responsibility and flexibility to meet those targets.

In order for agencies to function effectively, government departments and agencies will need to use to the full managerial freedoms and incentives and to delegate to the maximum extent the operation of these to local management; departments should substitute strategic management for detailed day-to-day 'hands on' control. Also, it is essential that key positions in the agencies are filled by people of high calibre and that agencies are utilised as a springboard to press for additional improvements in the delivery of services.

The most recently launched executive agency is the Laboratory of the Government Chemist, which was established as the Department of Trade and Industry's fourth agency under the Next Steps initiative on 30 October. The Laboratory will recover its full economic cost by charging for services rendered to customers. Its operating framework is designed to ensure that there will be open competition for analytical services, that the size and nature of the Laboratory will depend on the orders it gains and that customers will achieve increased value for money.

Of the 40 identified executive agency candidates, the following have been announced since July:

Air Officer Training (Defence Support — Ministry of Defence [MoD])

Cadw: Welsh Historic Monuments (Welsh Office)

Director General of Defence Accounts (Defence Support — MoD)

Hydrographer of the Navy (Defence Support — MoD)

Military Survey (Defence Support — MoD)

Property Holdings (Department of the Environment)

Service Children Education Authority (Defence Support — MoD)

Sources: *Developments in the Next Steps Programme. The Government Reply to the Fifth Report from the Treasury and Civil Service Committee, Session 1988-89, HC 348.* CM 841. HMSO, £2·60. ISBN 0 10 108412 9. *Hansard*, Vol 159, No 165, cols 16-17.

European Economic and Monetary Union

A market-based and evolutionary approach to European economic and monetary union has been put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr John Major. This reflects the British Government's preference for a partnership of individual European member states rather than a federation.

Economic and monetary union is the subject of a report by the European Commission President, M. Jacques Delors, and was discussed at the European Council in Madrid in June (see pp 270-2). The Council agreed to adopt the first stage of the proposals and to set in hand further preparatory work on developments beyond that stage.

The Delors Proposals

Speaking in the House of Commons on 2 November (*Hansard*, Vol 159, No 166, cols 488-95), the Chancellor said that although there was a long-standing commitment in Europe to the progressive realisation of economic and monetary union, there was no universal view of what such union entailed or when it ought to be achieved. However, there was a large measure of agreement among European Community member states on what they wanted to achieve. They sought price and currency stability and a single market with free movement of people, goods, services and capital. The only area of disagreement was on the means of achieving these objectives.

The choice, Mr Major continued, was between a federal Europe and a partnership of individual nation states. The Government favoured the latter. This harnessed the strength of national traditions and political structures; it built on the liberal, free-market policies that Britain had followed at home and in Europe; and it respected both parliamentary accountability and the diversity of member states.

The Government had already agreed to implement stage 1 of the Delors report. This included the establishment of a single market in goods, services and capital; the strengthening of competition policy; and the development of co-ordination of member states' economic and monetary policies. It also required membership of the exchange rate mechanism of the European Monetary System (EMS). Britain would join the mechanism when its rate of inflation had been significantly reduced, when there was capital liberalisation within the Community and when real progress had been made towards completion of the single European market (see p 49), freedom of financial services and strengthened competition policy.

While Britain was committed to stage 1, it parted company with the report on the next steps. These proposed permanently fixed exchange rates, a single Community currency, central rules on national budgetary policies and a European system of central banks with sole responsibility for monetary and exchange rate policy in the Community. The Government had 'very great difficulty with these proposals'.

Community rules on the use of national budget deficits were neither necessary nor desirable, the Chancellor explained. They were unnecessary because monetary unions could cope with a diversity of budgetary positions. Markets imposed the discipline that prevented deficits from moving too far out of line. They were undesirable because they jeopardised parliamentary financial control.

The Delors proposals for increased regional and structural aid also seemed misconceived. Instead, the less prosperous areas would benefit from a route to economic and monetary union that relied mainly on the operation of market forces rather than government intervention.

The proposals for monetary union were unacceptable as they made no provision for the accountability of monetary policy to national governments or parliaments. There would be no effective means of bringing the central banking system to account and there could be no guarantee that it would pursue successful anti-inflationary policies. On the contrary, by eliminating competition between monetary policies, it seemed likely that there would be harmonisation not on the lowest inflation performance but on the average.

Summarising the Government's objections to the Delors approach beyond stage 1, Mr Major said that it centralised power, it depended on administrative fiat and institutional change and it skated over vital issues of political accountability. 'Changes in economic and monetary arrangements must reflect real changes in economic behaviour in the market place and they must work with the grain of the market and not against it.'

Britain's Proposals

The Government was that day publishing a paper[1] which proposed an alternative – evolutionary –

[1] *An Evolutionary Approach to Economic and Monetary Union*. Available free from HM Treasury, Parliament Street, London SW1P 3AG.

approach to economic and monetary union. This approach, the Chancellor explained, was based on three principles: the overriding objective of price stability; increasing the influence of markets and competition; and 'subsidiarity' – retaining to the maximum extent possible national control over economic policy making.

Stage 1 of the Delors report would create powerful pressures on member states to adopt low-inflation policies. The removal of exchange controls and the creation of a single financial area would make capital markets respond more quickly to fears that a country was not operating sufficiently sound monetary policies. This would act as a powerful discipline. Increased stability of prices would lead to increased stability of exchange rates. 'All this will be achieved not through centralised regulation and direction but directly through the market. It achieves the desirable aims of the Delors report without the Delors apparatus.'

The Government's paper proposed taking the market approach of stage 1 forward to its logical conclusion rather than switching in midstream to a bureaucratic and centralised plan. Even after the completion of the single market a number of unnecessary restrictions would have the effect of muting market forces. Britain proposed that, as a priority after 1992, all restrictions of this kind should be examined and, where possible, removed so that competition between currencies and, therefore, monetary policies would be further sharpened.

The British proposals were for the abolition of unnecessary restrictions on individuals or firms carrying out business in whatever currency suited them. This was not a question of compelling the use of a particular currency: instead, the aim was to allow freedom of choice, thus enabling currencies to compete. With competing currencies, there would be pressure for Community monetary policies to harmonise at the level of the best, which would inevitably strengthen the process of convergence on price and exchange rate stability. Exchange rate realignments should therefore become rarer, fluctuations within the bands of the exchange rate mechanism should become smaller and there could eventually be a system of more or less fixed rates. With minimal exchange rate uncertainty and reduced costs of switching between currencies, this approach would lead to a multi-currency solution with interchangeable Community currencies. 'In that way we would achieve a practical monetary union as a result of a gradual evolutionary process but without disruptive constitutional change. In our judgment that is the right way forward.'

One risk of having a single currency, Mr Major explained, was that it placed great dependence on the ability of the European system of central banks to keep inflation down. 'Much safer in our view is our approach, which maintains national monetary policies and allows currencies to compete to provide the non-inflationary anchor in the EMS.'

Concluding, the Chancellor said that Britain aimed to play a central and constructive role in the debate on economic and monetary union in the European Community. Britain was as committed to Community objectives as any of its partners: 'Britain is playing a full part in Europe and we intend that to continue'.

Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting

The most recent in the series of biennial Commonwealth heads of Government meetings was held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 18 to 24 October. In addition to a final communiqué, the meeting issued statements on Southern Africa, the environment and Commonwealth Functional Co-operation. A separate statement on Southern Africa was issued by the British Government. Britain was represented at the meeting by the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, accompanied by the then Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr John Major.

Prime Minister's Statement

Reporting to the House of Commons on 26 October (*Hansard*, Vol 158, No 161, cols 1045-57), Mrs Thatcher said that the main issues discussed had been the global environment, Southern Africa, the future of the Commonwealth and drugs.

The meeting had issued a declaration on the environment setting out a Commonwealth programme of action, and the Prime Minister drew particular attention to the commitment to take more account of environmental considerations in reaching economic decisions; the support expressed for existing international environmental organisations, especially the United Nations Environment Programme; the endorsement of Britain's call for the negotiation of an international convention on global climate change; and the encouragement given to developing countries to improve the management of their rainforests. Mrs Thatcher said that Britain's particular concern with regard to these issues was that no additional resources should go to create new bureaucracies, but should be employed directly on measures to protect and improve the environment (see p 427). This concern was met fully in the Commonwealth's statement.

The Prime Minister said that the statement issued on Southern Africa marked a significant step forward from earlier Commonwealth statements. It recognised that important changes were under way in South Africa, that sanctions ought not to be punitive and that if sufficient political progress was made there, the process of relaxing some of the international restrictions against South Africa could begin. This, she said, was the first time that the Commonwealth had adopted this approach.

The Commonwealth statement also contained four main points with which Britain did not agree and Britain's disagreement was stated in the document but without explaining either the Government's view or the reasons for it. To fill this gap, a separate statement had been issued, setting out the British Government's views on these points. Mrs Thatcher said that the approach set out in the document was 'more positive and constructive' and took more account of the 'significant changes' that were happening in South Africa, including a decision taken by the South African Government during the Commonwealth heads of Government meeting that an African National Congress rally could be held, for the first time in 30 years. In the light of this and 'other recent steps', Mrs Thatcher said, 'our aim must surely be to reward progress and encourage South

Africa further down the path of reform, rather than to respond with more punitive sanctions'.

Britain's statement had made clear that, instead of making a financial contribution to the proposed agency to report on South Africa's international financial links or to the continuing work of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on South Africa, Britain would make an equivalent sum of money available for additional help to black South Africans.

Thirdly, the Prime Minister said that the heads of Government had discussed the future of the Commonwealth and had decided to set up a group of the heads of Government to identify the enlarged roles which the Commonwealth might need to play; Britain would be included in this group.

Fourthly, the Commonwealth had discussed the problem of drugs, recognising the very serious threat which they posed to all Commonwealth countries and the consequent need – especially for smaller states – for training in customs procedures, law enforcement, methods of detection, education and treatment of addicts. Mrs Thatcher had expressed the hope that by the time of the next heads of Government meeting, in 1991, a large number of Commonwealth countries would have concluded bilateral agreements on freezing and confiscating the assets of drug smugglers; Britain had now signed ten such agreements (see p 244).

The Prime Minister drew the House's attention to four further points in the communiqué. The first was a 'welcome reference to the importance of Hong Kong's continued success', and a commitment to assist its continued prosperity 'in any way possible'. This had been a major British objective at the meeting (see pp 267-70). The second was the reaffirmation of the need for speedy action to deal with the problem of Vietnamese 'boat people' in Hong Kong (see pp 265-7), including 'as a matter of priority' the return to Vietnam of all who did not qualify as 'genuine refugees'.

The third point was a recognition of the need to increase aviation security worldwide, particularly in the wake of the Lockerbie air disaster of December 1988 (see p 105), coupled with a strong denunciation of terrorism in all its forms and a call for the immediate safe release of all hostages. The fourth was a call on all Commonwealth Governments to accede to or ratify international covenants on human rights.

The Prime Minister concluded her statement by saying that the heads of Government meeting had been 'valuable and successful', despite the difference of views on South Africa.[1]

THE LANGKAWI DECLARATION ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The text of the Declaration, slightly abridged, is as follows:

We, the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth, representing a quarter of the world's population and a broad cross-section of global interests, are deeply concerned at the serious deterioration in the environment and the threat this poses to the well-being of present and future generations. Any delay in taking action to halt this progressive deterioration will result in permanent and irreversible damage....

The need to protect the environment should be viewed in a balanced perspective and due emphasis be accorded to promoting economic growth and sustainable development, including eradication of poverty, meeting basic needs, and enhancing the quality of life. The responsibility for ensuring a better environment should be equitably shared and the ability of developing countries to respond be taken into account.

To achieve sustainable development, economic growth is a compelling necessity. Sustainable development implies the incorporation of environmental concerns into economic planning and policies. Environmental concerns should not be used to introduce a new form of conditionality in aid and development financing, nor as a pretext for creating unjustified barriers to trade....

Recognising that our shared environment binds all countries to a common future, we, the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth, resolved to act collectively and individually, commit ourselves to the following programme of action:

– advance policies and programmes which help achieve sustainable development, including the development of new and better techniques in integrating the environmental dimension in economic decision-making;

– strengthen and support the development of international funding mechanisms and appropriate decision-making procedures to respond to environmental protection needs which will include assisting developing countries to obtain access to and transfer of needed environmental technologies and which should take account of proposals for an international environment fund/Planet Protection Fund;

– support the work of the UNEP/WMO [United Nations Environment Programme/World Meteorological Organisation] *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC);*[1]

– call for the early conclusion of an international convention to protect and conserve the global climate and, in this context, applaud the efforts of member governments to advance the negotiation of a framework convention under UN auspices;

– support the findings and recommendations of the Commonwealth Expert Group's Report on Climate Change as a basis for achievable action to develop strategies for adapting to climate change and for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as well as making an important contribution to the work of the IPCC;

– support measures to improve energy conservation and energy efficiency;

– promote the reduction and eventual phase-out of substances depleting the ozone layer;

– promote afforestation and agricultural practices in developed and developing countries to arrest the

[1]For further information on Britain's views on the main issues discussed at the meeting, see COI reference paper *Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting 1989*, No 123/89.

[1]This was established in 1988 and has set up three working groups to report by 1990. The first group, led by Britain, is carrying out an assessment of the scientific evidence. The second and third, led by the United States and the Soviet Union respectively, are reviewing evidence on potential effects and investigating possible responses.

increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide and halt the deterioration of land and water resources;

– strengthen efforts by developing countries in sustainable forest management and their manufacture and export of higher value-added forest products and, in this regard, support the activities of the International Tropical Timber Organisation and the Food and Agriculture Organisation's Tropical Forestry Action Plan, as well as take note of the recommendations of the 13th Commonwealth Forestry Conference;[1]

– support activities related to the conservation of biological diversity and genetic resources, including the conservation of significant areas of virgin forest and other protected natural habitats;

– support low-lying and island countries in their efforts to protect themselves and their vulnerable natural marine ecosystems from the effects of sea level rise;

– discourage and restrict non-sustainable fishing practices and seek to ban tangle net and pelagic drift net fishing;

– support efforts to prevent marine pollution, including curbing ocean dumping of toxic wastes;

– strengthen international action to ensure the safe management and disposal of hazardous wastes and to reduce transboundary movements, particularly to prevent dumping in developing countries;

– participate in relevant international agreements relating to the environment and promote new and innovative instruments which will attract widespread support for protecting the global environment; and

– strengthen national, regional and international institutions responsible for environmental education to heighten public awareness and support....

SOUTHERN AFRICA: THE WAY AHEAD

The texts of the statements on Southern Africa issued by the heads of Government and by Britain are given here in their entirety.

THE KUALA LUMPUR STATEMENT

South Africa

Heads of Government continued to view the system of apartheid in South Africa as a serious challenge to the values and principles of the Commonwealth and reaffirmed that its total eradication remained their shared responsibility and common goal.

Heads of Government reviewed the situation in South Africa against the possibility that significant changes in approach on the part of the South African regime, for which the Commonwealth had striven for so long, may yet prove to be within reach. In recent weeks, the regime had accepted a degree of peaceful political activity by the black majority and on the eve of this meeting had released from prison eight political leaders.

However, they noted that the state of emergency remained in force; the ANC [African National Congress], *the PAC* [Pan-Africanist Congress] *and many other organisations remain banned; Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners remained incarcerated; many more continued to be detained without trial; and executions in political cases had not stopped. There had also been no action to indicate that the new South African Government was prepared to dismantle the pillars of apartheid, especially the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act, the Bantustan 'homelands' policy and the system of separate education.*

Heads of Government agreed that such encouraging signs as there had been were very much the product of a combination of internal and external pressures. In this context they welcomed the role now being played by the Mass Democratic Movement in its sustained, disciplined and peaceful opposition to apartheid. They attached importance to acceptance of peaceful demonstrations and political manifestations as a test of the sincerity of the new Government and its professed desire for change.

In considering the way forward, Heads of Government reiterated their preference for a negotiated and peaceful settlement and in this context reaffirmed the continuing validity of the EPG [Eminent Persons Group]*'s 'Possible Negotiating Concept'* [see p 215, 1986]. *Among other measures, that Concept calls for:*

On the part of the (South African) Government:

(a) Removal of the military from the townships, providing for freedom of assembly and discussion and suspension of detention without trial.
(b) The release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and detainees.
(c) The unbanning of the ANC and PAC and the permitting of normal political activity.

On the part of the ANC and others:

Entering negotiations and suspending violence.

They noted with satisfaction the strong preference for the path of negotiated and peaceful settlement also inherent in the 1989 Harare Declaration of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Organisation of African Unity on Southern Africa endorsed by the Non-Aligned Movement at its Belgrade Summit last month. It is agreed on all sides that the South African Government and the authentic representatives of the majority population should come to the table prepared to negotiate the future of the country and its people in good faith, in an atmosphere free of violence from either side.

Heads of Government had recognised in their Nassau Accord [see pp 344-5, 1985] *that the constitutional system was a matter for all the people of South Africa to decide. They continued to believe*

[1]The International Tropical Timber Organisation, comprising timber-producing and -consuming countries, aims at improving forest management and replenishment. The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's Tropical Forestry Action Plan promotes improved forestry and the conservation of forests. The 13th Commonwealth Forestry Conference was held in New Zealand in September and made specific recommendations to the Commonwealth heads of Government meeting. These were: to urge members to institute programmes and incentives to promote forest restoration and afforestation; and to establish a special Commonwealth support fund to enable member countries to play their full part in implementing the Tropical Forestry Action Plan by increasing the resources for project preparation and implementation, and for promoting regional activities, particularly those that promote the reconciliation of environmental interests and sustainable forest management. They also endorsed the formation of a group of Commonwealth forestry advisers to implement the proposal.

that the Commonwealth's role in this regard was essentially to facilitate the opening of negotiations between the South African authorities and authentic black leaders.

They agreed that the only justification for sanctions against South Africa was the pressure they created for fundamental political change. Their purpose was not punitive, but to abolish apartheid by bringing Pretoria to the negotiating table and keeping it there until that change was irreversibly secured. In this respect Heads of Government noted that leading personalities in the South African Government had themselves acknowledged the increasing pressures on the South African economy, and that those pressures would not be diminished until fundamental political change had taken place.

Heads of Government, other than Britain, also acknowledged that the impact of sanctions had begun to influence the policies of the South African regime. The effectiveness of sanctions in this regard had also been demonstrated by the Report on Sanctions commissioned by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa and prepared by a group of independent experts which was before the Meeting. They considered that the Report had made a significant contribution towards public understanding of the issues, and that its recommendations would need to be considered in the light of developments in South Africa and the region.

In considering what further steps they might take to advance the prospects for negotiations, Heads of Government expressed the view that this was not the time to consider any relaxation of existing sanctions and pressures. That would have to await evidence of clear and irreversible change. In the meantime, they agreed that all existing sanctions and measures should be maintained, and they called upon the wider international community to do likewise.

They also agreed, with the exception of Britain, that such measures should be tightened, and decided in this context:

(a) to develop new forms of financial pressure on the Pretoria regime by seeking to intensify and extend financial sanctions, in particular by

– calling on all relevant banks and financial institutions to impose tougher conditions on day-to-day trade financing, specifically through reducing the maximum credit terms to 90 days; and

– calling on relevant governments to make trade credits harder to get by taking South Africa "off cover" with official government agencies for official trade credit and insurance purposes,

and agreed that their Chairman should communicate these decisions to the relevant financial institutions and to other governments; and

(b) to support the initiative developed by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa to strengthen the arms embargo, and continue to pursue it at the United Nations in the 421 Committee.[1]

[1]Security Council Resolution 421 (1977) established a committee comprising all members of the Council to study ways of making the UN arms embargo against South Africa more effective and to monitor states' compliance with it.

Heads of Government recognised the importance of South Africa's dealings with the international financial community and therefore, with the exception of Britain, endorsed the establishment of an independent agency to review and report on South Africa's international financial links on a regular basis, and to gather and publicise factual information on financial flows to, and policies towards, South Africa. They welcomed the offer of the Government of Australia to provide substantial initial funding.

Heads of Government noted that the longer apartheid remained in South Africa, the greater the challenge that would face a future government in rebuilding the South African economy. In particular they noted that the resumption of international lending to South Africa would not be automatic and that an international effort to assist in the mobilisation of resources would probably be necessary. They agreed to ask appropriate international financial institutions, and in particular the IMF [International Monetary Fund]*, to examine now how resources might be mobilised upon evidence of clear and irreversible change.*

Heads of Government welcomed increasing instances of dialogue among South Africans across the racial divide. They were encouraged by the proposals for negotiations, many elements of which reflected Commonwealth concepts, which had been advanced by leaders of the black majority. In this regard, they agreed to continue, individually and collectively, to take advantage of all opportunities to promote dialogue among South Africans.

They agreed that the Commonwealth should continue to provide support to the victims and opponents of apartheid within South Africa. Of importance were educational programmes, including in particular the Nassau Fellowships,[1] *legal and humanitarian assistance to detainees and their families, support for the trade union movement, and economic and social development programmes including low-cost housing projects.*

They attached importance to the work of the newly established Commonwealth network of non-governmental organisations, "Skills for South Africa", to provide high-level training and work experience for victims of apartheid and so contribute both to the process of change in South Africa and the development of the skills required in a post-apartheid society. They undertook to provide support and resources to assist in the implementation and co-ordination of this work.

Heads of Government reaffirmed the continuing high priority of the Commonwealth effort to expose the truth about apartheid and to counter South African propaganda and censorship. They welcomed the Commonwealth strategy prepared by the Working Party set up as part of the Okanagan Programme of Action [see pp 352-4, 1987]*. They noted that a number of countries had already implemented and funded national action plans. They stressed the particular importance of the support being given to the embattled alternative press and other groups in South Africa resisting censorship.*

[1]At their Nassau meeting in 1985, Commonwealth heads of Government agreed to establish fellowships enabling South African victims of apartheid to study in Commonwealth countries. More than 300 people received such fellowships in 1988-89.

Namibia

Heads of Government welcomed the implementing of Resolution 435 [see p130]*, and looked forward to the holding of free and fair elections leading to the emergence of a genuinely independent Namibia. They reaffirmed their full support for the United Nations Secretary-General, and the UN's efforts to ensure the integrity of the Settlement Plan. Heads of Government looked forward to welcoming a free Namibia into the Commonwealth.*

They noted that the Report of the Commonwealth Observer Group on Namibia had identified a number of areas of urgent need if an independent Government emerging from the Resolution 435 process was to be able to govern effectively. They accordingly called for the provision of a special and enlarged multilateral package of assistance in addition to bilateral aid. To this end they requested the Commonwealth Secretary-General to send a small team of experts to Namibia as soon as practicable after the elections to advise on possible Commonwealth assistance.

Heads of Government also noted that the Report drew attention to what the Group had viewed as moves by the South African Government to retain a continuing ability to destabilise an independent Namibia, and they were of the view that any steps taken by South Africa to this end would inevitably call into question its declarations of good faith in respect of these and other matters, and particularly its expressed desire now to seek peaceful co-existence with its neighbours.

Heads of Government called on all the parties to the Resolution 435 Settlement Plan and all political groups within Namibia to fully meet their respective responsibilities and obligations, including full co-operation with the UN authorities, to conclude the process of bringing into being a free, independent and stable Namibia.

Heads of Government expressed their concern that a post-independence Namibia be able fully to realise its economic potential and contribute to the development of the larger Southern Africa region. In this respect, they expressed the hope that the early re-integration of Walvis Bay into Namibia in accordance with Security Council Resolution 432 (1978) would be able to be achieved, noting that compliance with this by South Africa would be a convincing demonstration of its good faith and commitment to the long-term viability of its newly independent neighbour.

Other Developments in the Southern African Region

Heads of Government noted that notwithstanding international condemnation, South Africa's campaign of destabilisation against its neighbours had resulted in untold misery and destruction and was graphically documented in The Destabilisation Report.[1]

Despite some welcome improvement in the security situation in the south-west of the African continent, Heads of Government observed that the MNR [Mozambique National Resistance]*'s murderous activities continued on a major scale in Mozambique and elsewhere; and destabilisation remained a major factor in the region's security crisis. Heads of Government unreservedly condemned South Africa's support for the MNR and other acts of destabilisation. Heads of Government reiterated the view, however, that only the eradication of apartheid in South Africa would enable the region to develop in peace.*

Special efforts were needed to strengthen and develop the economies of Southern Africa so as to relieve them of South African economic domination. Heads of Government considered that the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) [see pp 97-8] *deserved particular support and encouragement. To that end, they mandated the Secretary-General to carry out an Action Plan in consultation with SADCC, the AFRICA Fund,*[1] *the Preferential Trade Area*[2] *and the interested states in the region and elsewhere, to promote trade and investment in the Front-Line and neighbouring states. In the provision of assistance to SADCC countries, efforts should also be made, where possible, to purchase capital goods and services from within the region thus stimulating regional production, employment, trade and transportation.*

Heads of Government identified a continuing need for assistance to the Front-Line States. While there had been significant contributions in this area by a number of Commonwealth and other governments, much remained to be done to meet the security needs identified in the special report by General Olusegun Obasanjo, commissioned by the Vancouver Meeting.

Heads of Government welcomed the successful establishment of the Special Commonwealth Fund for Mozambique, which had augmented bilateral contributions from Commonwealth countries including those of the Front-Line States. Heads of Government recognised the importance of continuing contributions to the Fund in view of Mozambique's key geographical position and its role in Southern Africa.

Continuing Review

With the exception of Britain, Heads of Government commended the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers established by the Okanagan Statement for its reports, and agreed that it should continue with its work, under the chairmanship of the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs; that the Foreign Minister of Malaysia be added to its members; and that it report again when Heads of Government next meet. They expressed the wish that it reconvene in April, some six months after the new administration in Pretoria took office.

BRITAIN'S VIEW

The separate statement setting out Britain's views is as follows:

[1] A report on the destabilisation of states neighbouring South Africa. It was one of four reports commissioned by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa and presented to the heads of Government at Kuala Lumpur. The others were on the impact of sanctions on South Africa, South Africa's links with the international financial system, and Commonwealth strategy to combat South African propaganda and censorship.

[1] The Fund was established by the Non-Aligned Movement in 1986 to assist the 'front-line states' of Southern Africa.

[2] The Preferential Trade Area was established in 1982 and comprises 15 countries in Southern and eastern Africa.

Britain is fully at one with the rest of the Commonwealth in utterly condemning apartheid and wishing to see its total eradication so that all the inhabitants of South Africa can live in dignity and play a full part in the political life of their country.

Britain welcomes the recognition in the Kuala Lumpur statement:

– that change is underway in South Africa;

– that sanctions should not be punitive and that the international community will need to respond to evidence of clear and irreversible change; and

– that both sides should come to the negotiating table in an atmosphere free of violence from either side.

But Britain believes the Commonwealth can help a new South Africa to emerge in much more positive ways than those set out in the Kuala Lumpur statement.

In Britain's view there have been important and positive changes in South Africa since the last meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government in Vancouver. Seventy per cent of white South Africans voted for change in the recent elections [see p 371] *and there is now a government firmly committed to the concept of negotiations. Peaceful political activity by the black majority has been accepted and eight of the political prisoners whose release has long been a goal of Commonwealth countries have been set free.*[1]

In this new situation, Britain believes that the Commonwealth should concentrate now on encouraging change rather than on further punishment. Whatever their intention, the effect of sanctions is punitive. All the evidence is that they bear hardest on the poorest and weakest members of South Africa's black population, depriving them of the dignity of jobs and the ability to care for their families. South Africa's population is growing very rapidly and the country needs economic growth to provide a decent standard of living for its people. Sanctions, in particular financial sanctions, have the effect of deliberately depriving South Africa of access to the funds which it needs in order to grow. They thus put out of reach the possibility of improving living standards for all South Africans. Sanctions contribute to poverty and misery in South Africa, whereas Britain's efforts are directed to helping relieve poverty and misery throughout Africa as a whole.

Moreover, virtually every opinion poll – recent examples being those in The Independent *newspaper and on* Independent Television News[2] *– shows a clear majority against sanctions when it is made clear they would involve loss of jobs. Even the recent book "Sanctions Against Apartheid"*[3] *shows that 78 per cent of those asked did not feel sanctions would be worthwhile if many blacks were to lose their jobs as a result.*

Britain does not agree that sanctions have the political effects claimed for them. While they certainly weaken the South African economy, the political effect of sanctions is to increase resistance to change rather than encourage change. There seems to be a clear correlation between the imposition of additional sanctions by the US Congress and the Commonwealth and the strength of extreme right-wing parties in South Africa utterly opposed to change.

Britain believes in a constructive way forward in Southern Africa. The first step is to implement the concept developed by the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, to open the way to serious negotiations to start about the future of South Africa. This requires:

– release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners;

– lifting of the State of Emergency;

– unbanning of political organisations;

– all against the background of suspension of violence.

South Africa has taken the first steps down this road and must be encouraged by all possible measures of peaceful persuasion to proceed further. As and when South Africa does take the necessary steps then it would be right to lift some of the measures imposed by the international community, so as to reward progress and encourage South Africa to continue further down the road of reform. The aim should be to secure positive influence with the South African Government rather than add to the sanctions which have been largely fruitless.

At the same time, Britain will continue its substantial programme of positive help for black South Africans and neighbouring countries. This includes expenditure of some ten million pounds a year on measures in South Africa itself:

– to finance nearly 1,000 black South Africans in higher education;

– to contribute substantially to a scheme to create more low-cost housing for black South Africans;[1]

– to support nearly 300 rural projects;

– to bring relief to refugees from Mozambique; and

– to support Operation Hunger,[2] *which already provides food for 1·3 million black South Africans, including many children.*

At the same time Britain will continue its very substantial programme of assistance to the Front-Line States, which already totals some 1·1 billion pounds since 1980 [see pp 97-9]. *Rather than contribute to the cost of the independent agency proposed by the rest of the Commonwealth to review and report on South Africa's international financial links, and of the continuing work of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on South*

[1]The South African Government released eight political prisoners, including Walter Sisulu, the former Secretary-General of the African National Congress, shortly before the Commonwealth heads of Government meeting.

[2]This was in fact a single poll conducted on behalf of *The Independent* newspaper and Independent Television News. The survey, which interviewed 550 black South Africans living in metropolitan areas, showed that 54·7 per cent of those interviewed were against the imposition of economic sanctions to bring about the end of apartheid.

[3]A book launched for the heads of Government meeting by proponents of sanctions within South Africa.

[1]An initiative by the Urban Foundation of South Africa, a non-governmental body. The scheme comprises the establishment of a loan guarantee fund of £4·6 million, sponsored principally by international and South African businesses. It is intended to permit the release of loans from South African building societies. Britain has announced that it will contribute up to £500,000.

[2]Operation Hunger, which was established in 1980, is a non-governmental organisation working in South Africa to provide food and other assistance for projects in rural areas.

Africa, Britain will contribute an equivalent amount for additional help to black South Africans.

Britain also gives its unequivocal support to the United Nations Secretary-General in securing the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 in Namibia. It will be for him and his representative alone to judge whether the elections are fully free and fair. It will not be for any other group or body to pronounce on this or attempt to qualify or vary in any respect the provisions of the United Nations Plan. At the same time, Britain is ready to provide financial assistance to an independent Namibia as well as, if asked, military training for Namibia's armed forces after independence as we have done for Zimbabwe, Mozambique and other African countries.

Britain believes that recent developments in Southern Africa show that progress can be made by peaceful negotiation, whether it be in Namibia, in Angola or in Mozambique. While the future of South Africa itself must be for the people – all the people – of that country to decide, Britain wants to see the Commonwealth and the international community as a whole re-double their efforts to support peaceful change and enable the new South Africa to inherit a strong economy. This will more likely be achieved by the positive and constructive steps set out in this statement than by tightening sanctions and the imposition of new punitive measures as proposed by the rest of the Commonwealth.

FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

The text of the heads of Government meeting's final communiqué, slightly abridged, is as follows:

The Commonwealth in the 1990s and Beyond

. . . in looking more closely at the future of the Commonwealth as it faces the years ahead, Commonwealth leaders accepted the Secretary-General's proposal for a high-level group to identify possible roles which the Commonwealth might need to play, and to examine whether its institutions, including the Secretariat, are adequately equipped for the task. This wide-ranging appraisal of future Commonwealth roles and structures should be completed in time for a report to the next Heads of Government Meeting in 1991 . . .

Heads of Government also agreed that one area where the Commonwealth might usefully make a distinctive contribution is in the strengthening of democratic institutions in member countries. Heads of Government have long recognised a commitment to democratic processes as being among the values they most cherish. It was an ethic enshrined in the 1971 Singapore Declaration of Commonwealth Principles in which member countries undertook 'to promote in each of their territories those representative institutions and guarantees of personal freedom under the law that are our common heritage'. In reaffirming these principles and in reviewing the international political scene, Heads of Government agreed with the Secretary-General's proposal that one of the Commonwealth's contributions to strengthening democracy might be the provision of Commonwealth assistance in helping member countries to reinforce their election and other constitutional processes through a facility for mounting observer missions at the request of member governments, and in responding to such requests in other relevant ways. They requested that the modalities of such a facility and related assistance should be examined in greater detail by the high-level group on future Commonwealth roles. . . .

Commonwealth leaders agreed that the high-level appraisal group should comprise the Heads of Government of Australia, Bahamas, Britain, Canada, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, Nigeria, Singapore and Zambia. . . .

Global Trends and Prospects

Heads of Government welcomed the improved international political environment and . . . recognised that the reduction in East-West tensions had stimulated significant changes in the international political environment, not only in respect of disarmament and arms limitation, but also in relation to the abatement of regional conflicts, the relaxation of long intractable situations, and the spread of democracy. In particular, they emphasised the important role of democratic processes in ensuring the freedom of choice for all peoples.

They observed that the improvement in the international political climate had come about as a result of initiatives and changes on a wide front and that therefore the responsibility for continuing and building on these achievements rested upon the whole world community, East and West and North and South. . . .

Heads of Government reaffirmed their commitment to the principles and precepts of the Charter of the United Nations and to the goal of strengthening the United Nations system as the central instrument of peace, security and co-operation among nations. They welcomed the increasing role of the United Nations in contributing to conflict resolution in many regions of the world, thereby enhancing international security, and paid particular tribute to the role played by the United Nations Secretary-General. They called for enhancing the financial viability of the organisation.

Disarmament

Heads of Government noted that the Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty [see pp 9-11, 1988] *marked the first time that a decision had been made to eliminate a nuclear weapons system. They hoped that the super powers would continue to make every effort to prevent an arms race in outer space and terminate it on earth. They welcomed the progress made in Geneva towards a draft treaty that proposed to reduce significantly the number of strategic nuclear weapons on either side. This, combined with the steps taken to reduce conventional forces, would contribute to the objective of world peace and security.*

Most Heads of Government called for an immediate suspension of and complete ban on nuclear testing. All acknowledged the central role of the United Nations as a forum for multilateral discussions and negotiations on arms control and disarmament matters.

Heads of Government concurred with the Final Document from the Paris Conference on Chemical Weapons held in January 1989 which advocated the complete elimination of chemical weapons [see pp

10-12]. ... *They urged all parties to sustain the momentum towards concluding a convention on the prohibition of development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons at the earliest possible date.* ...

Belize

Heads of Government reaffirmed their full support for the efforts of the Government of Belize to maintain its territorial integrity and consolidate its independence and sovereignty. They welcomed the agreement that had been reached in 1988 between Belize and Guatemala on the establishment of a Permanent Joint Commission which would be responsible for preparing a comprehensive draft treaty which would provide a joint and honourable solution to the dispute. They hoped that speedy progress would be made in achieving a lasting settlement. Renewing their commitment to co-operate in the search for a settlement, they requested the Secretary-General to convene the Commonwealth Ministerial Committee on Belize whenever necessary. They commended the continuing role of the British Government in helping to provide for Belize's security [see p 290, 1986]. ...

Middle East

Heads of Government expressed deep concern at the dangerous tensions arising from the unresolved problems of the Middle East, especially the Palestinian issue. They recognised that a just and lasting settlement should be on the basis of the relevant United Nations Resolutions, the withdrawal of Israel from territories occupied since 1967, and recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people, including their inalienable right to a homeland, as well as the right of all states in the region to live in peace within secure borders.

They expressed deep concern at the deteriorating situation in the Occupied Territories and their alarm at the constant increase in the number of dead and wounded. They appealed urgently to the Israeli authorities to exercise utmost restraint in the Occupied Territories, to implement Resolutions 605, 607 and 608 of the Security Council, and to respect the provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War [see pp 14-15, 1988].[1]

Reviewing international developments in relation to the Middle East crisis, Heads of Government welcomed the growing momentum in favour of the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations, with participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestinians, on an equal footing. They urged the Permanent Members of the Security Council to intensify efforts aimed at setting in motion the preparatory process for the Peace Conference. They welcomed the continuing dialogue between the United States and the Palestine Liberation Organisation as a positive contribution in the search for a durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

Heads of Government . . . reaffirmed their support for the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon. They welcomed the establishment of a cease-fire in Lebanon. They expressed their full support for the efforts of the Arab League Committee of Three in helping to resolve the crisis and called on all parties to co-operate with it.

South East Asia

Heads of Government noted recent significant developments in the region, and the growing recognition of their long-held view that the only means of ensuring a just and durable peace in Cambodia and stability in the region was through a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodia problem. They reaffirmed their support for the right of the people of Cambodia to determine their own destiny free from foreign interference. They noted that the announced withdrawal by Vietnam of its troops from Cambodia [see p 344] *has not been verified under United Nations supervision and that it does not fall within the framework of a comprehensive political settlement.*

Heads of Government welcomed the various initiatives . . . to promote the peace process and . . . noted with regret the lack of progress that had been made by the Paris Conference on Cambodia in August 1989 [see pp 344-5]. *They urged that efforts should be continued to intensify dialogue and promote negotiations to achieve a comprehensive political settlement in Cambodia and welcomed the role of Commonwealth countries in seeking to promote this objective.* ...

Heads of Government noted with approval efforts to establish in South East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality and called on all states to fully support these efforts. ...

The Gulf

Heads of Government were encouraged by the acceptance by Iran and Iraq of Security Council Resolution 598 and the cease-fire that came into effect on 20 August 1988, following the intensive efforts by the United Nations Secretary-General to promote negotiations between the parties [see pp 267-8, 1988]. *They reaffirmed their support for the mission of good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General and urged both parties to co-operate with him and intensify their efforts to achieve a lasting settlement of the conflict.*

Afghanistan

Heads of Government . . . welcomed the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan in accordance with the Geneva Agreements [see p 94] *and . . . expressed their support for the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General, consistent with his mandate under General Assembly Resolution, 43/20 of 3 November 1988, for realising a political settlement in Afghanistan.*[1] *They called for the early start of an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establish-*

[1]Resolution 608, adopted in January 1968, called on Israel to rescind deportation orders against Palestinian civilians and to ensure the return of those already deported.

[1]This resolution called on all parties to the April 1988 Geneva agreement on Afghanistan (see pp 164-6, 1988) to work for its implementation and for the achievement of a comprehensive settlement that would enable Afghan refugees to return home. It also emphasised the need for dialogue on establishing a broadly based government and called for international assistance to help refugees and the social and economic recovery of Afghanistan. The UN Secretary-General was requested to 'encourage and facilitate the early realisation of a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan' in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva agreement and of the present resolution.

ment of a broad-based government that would enjoy the widest support and in which representatives of all segments of the Afghan people would take part. Such a government would lead to the restoration of peace and normality in Afghanistan, the voluntary return of the Afghan refugees and the free exercise of the right of the Afghan people to determine their own future. They urged respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and non-aligned status of Afghanistan.

Heads of Government also appealed to the international community for continued humanitarian assistance for the Afghan refugees as well as the provision of adequate resources to the United Nations Special Co-ordinator for the repatriation and rehabilitation of the refugees and the reconstruction of the country.

Hong Kong

Mindful of the now long established participation by Hong Kong people in Commonwealth activities, Heads of Government stressed the importance of Hong Kong's continued success as an international trading and financial centre. They acknowledged the concerns of the people of Hong Kong and agreed that those in a position to do so would assist in any way possible in promoting the continued prosperity of Hong Kong. In this connection, Heads of Government welcomed the reaffirmation by China and Britain of their commitment to the full implementation of the Sino-British Joint Declaration on the future of Hong Kong, the success of which was vital to the maintenance of international confidence in Hong Kong [see pp 267-70].

Vietnamese Boat People

Heads of Government recognised that the continuing exodus of boat people from Vietnam has imposed an insuperable burden on countries and places of first asylum in the region. They reaffirmed the need for concrete actions speedily to resolve the problem through repatriation, and resettlement. They welcomed the progress towards a comprehensive solution of the problem of Vietnamese boat people made at the International Conference on Indo-Chinese Refugees held in Geneva in June 1989, which had adopted a Comprehensive Plan of Action, and subsequent meetings [see pp 265-7]. *Countries and places of first asylum faced special difficulties in relation to the flow of boat people from Vietnam. They believed that, as a matter of priority, there should be a programme for the return to Vietnam of all those who have been determined as not being genuine refugees. They believed that the Orderly Departure Programme must remain the sole mode of departure from Vietnam, and urged that Vietnam expands and fully implements the Programme.*

Heads of Government also called on all resettlement countries to fulfil their commitment to resettle the Vietnamese boat people who are eligible to be regarded as genuine refugees and to increase their off-take in order to cope with the increased in-flow. ...

Small States

Heads of Government reaffirmed their view that because of their particular problems small states merit special measures of support in safeguarding their territorial integrity. They noted with satisfaction that Maldives, in November 1988, with the help of a Commonwealth neighbour, successfully countered an externally mounted coup attempt,[1] *and expressed concern about the continued vulnerability of small states. They called for urgent attention at all levels, bilateral, regional, and multilateral, to the establishment of security arrangements which would create an environment which buttresses the territorial integrity and general viability of these states, and expressed their support for the current initiative by Maldives at the United Nations to improve international co-operation in this respect, both within and outside the United Nations.*

Heads of Government further reaffirmed that small states should continue to have priority in the economic and developmental programmes of the Commonwealth Secretariat.

Human Rights

Heads of Government affirmed that all human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interrelated and . . . reaffirmed their commitment to the observance of all human rights. They stressed the importance of the work of the Secretariat's Human Rights Unit in promoting understanding and respect for human rights within the Commonwealth, in accordance with the principles enshrined in Commonwealth Declarations and the main international human rights instruments in particular as enshrined in the two International Covenants.[2] *They urged those governments which had not done so to ratify or accede to those instruments. They asked the Secretariat to continue to facilitate exchanges of information on law reform, national institutions and domestic procedures for the promotion of human rights in Commonwealth countries. ...*

Terrorism

Heads of Government reaffirmed their condemnation of terrorism in all its forms ... and reiterated their determination to combat it by every means possible through bilateral and multilateral co-operation. In particular they noted the serious terrorist threat posed to civil aviation in the form of both hijacking and sabotage. They recognised the need to enhance measures worldwide to increase aviation security and protect air travellers. In this context they welcomed the contribution made by the International Civil Aviation Organisation[3] *and its work on an initiative to make certain explosives more easily*

[1] A force of foreign mercenaries, led by dissident Maldivians, attempted to seize power on 3 November 1988. The coup was put down swiftly by Indian troops, who were invited by the Government of Maldives.

[2] The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Both came into force in 1976. The former deals with conditions of work, trade unions, social security, protection of the family, standards of living and health, education and cultural life. The latter addresses such rights as freedom of movement, equality before the law, presumption of innocence, freedom of conscience and religion and of opinion and expression, peaceful assembly, freedom of association, participation in public affairs and elections, and minority rights. It prohibits arbitrary deprivation of life, torture, cruel or degrading treatment or punishment, slavery and forced labour, arbitrary arrest or detention and arbitrary interference with privacy, war propaganda and advocacy of racial or religious hatred.

[3] Founded in 1947, the International Civil Aviation Organisation is responsible for setting safety standards and practices. It has over 150 members.

detectable. They urged all countries to strengthen their adherence to relevant legal instruments and to fulfil their obligations under international law, particularly the obligation to refrain from organising, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other states or acquiescing in activities within their territories directed towards the commission of such acts. In particular they stressed the need to ensure that terrorists are brought to justice and are denied a safe haven.

They called for the immediate safe release of all hostages wherever and by whomever they are held and called upon all states to use their political influence in accordance both with the principles of international law and with humanitarian obligations to secure the safe release of all hostages and abducted persons.

Countering Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking

Heads of Government recalled their long-standing concern at the incidence of drug abuse and illicit trafficking, activities which had now grown to the extent that they posed an actual threat to the governance of some countries. They recognised that the drug problem was escalating at an alarming rate so as to represent both a serious obstacle to the processes of social and economic domestic development and a threat to the international community, to which small states were especially vulnerable. Heads of Government saw the need for an urgent strengthening of the capacity of the relevant international agencies so as to equip them more appropriately to address the problems. In particular, they welcomed initiatives to these ends being taken by the Governments of Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago in the United Nations [see p 434] *and believed that the Commonwealth should take the lead in promoting more effective national and international action on a number of key fronts. In this context they supported the enactment of appropriate legislation to attack drug trafficking and money-laundering, including provisions for the confiscation of the illicit assets of convicted drug traffickers. They agreed to support United Nations expert group studies on all the ways of using the United Nations system to fight the drugs menace. They also attached special importance to measures to promote crop substitution programmes and, in view of the connection between supply and consumption, to educational programmes among young people designed to reduce demand.*

Heads of Government welcomed action in Commonwealth countries to implement the Commonwealth Scheme for Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters[1] *and looked forward to the early achievement of effective, Commonwealth-wide arrangements. They acknowledged that efficient arrangements for the extradition of fugitive offenders are central to efforts to combat international crime, and requested their Law Ministers to ensure that the requirements for intra-Commonwealth extradition are no more onerous than those for extradition as between Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth countries.*

Heads of Government expressed their pleasure at the successful conclusion of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances [see p 15], *and urged all members of the international community to accord priority to its early ratification and implementation. Reference was also made to the proposed London Conference on Demand Reduction and Cocaine in April 1990* [see p 244] *and the hope expressed that Commonwealth governments would be represented.*

Heads of Government expressed their strong support for the Government of Colombia in its fight against the drugs problem, and stood ready to provide what assistance they could.

World Economic Situation

. . . Heads of Government noted that in the industrial countries sustained growth was now threatened by inflation. While recognising the need to control inflation, they acknowledged the problems for developing countries inherent in prolonged high interest rates. They felt determined efforts should be made to avoid a recurrence of recession. . . .

Heads of Government noted that in some developing countries economic performance continued to be strong as a result of successful economic management. They emphasised the importance of adjustment for revitalising growth in developing countries. They stressed the need to enhance competitiveness and the use of market mechanisms in order to facilitate adjustment and growth. However, despite the widespread adoption of such adjustment policies, many developing countries continued to face severe problems, aggravated by unfavourable external factors such as high international rates of interest, insufficient resource transfers, low commodity prices and increasing protectionism. They expressed their determination to work for a more supportive global economic environment.

Heads of Government emphasised that an important opportunity was offered by reduced East-West tensions to reinvigorate efforts to tackle other major world problems, particularly poverty. They expressed hope that assistance to support economic reform in East European countries should not result in decreased financial flows to developing countries. They called for greater global solidarity in response to the major economic and environmental challenges and for a special effort to improve development co-operation.

Heads of Government noted the rapid changes in the world economy. These needed continuing review, especially as regards their impact on economically weak countries. They were pleased to note that Commonwealth Finance Ministers in Kingston[1] *had asked for a Commonwealth Expert Group to examine how recent changes and emerging trends in the world economy affected the inter-relationship between developed and developing countries. They asked that major international institutions, including official and private financial institutions, should be associated with the examination. They also*

[1]This was adopted by Commonwealth law ministers in 1986 and welcomed by heads of Government at Vancouver in 1987 (see p 349, 1987). It establishes a framework for greater co-operation between the law enforcement agencies of member states and provides for the international enforcement of orders confiscating the proceeds of crime.

[1]Commonwealth finance ministers meet annually. The meeting at Kingston was in September 1989.

asked that the Expert Group should report as soon as possible, if necessary confining itself in the first instance to an interim report summarising the main issues of concern to the world community. ...

They believed that the global political and economic climate was much more propitious for dialogue than for many years. There was broad agreement on the principles necessary to bring about sound development. But developing countries were faced with grave resource constraints in applying those principles. They believed it might be right for the Commonwealth, within which dialogue had not been interrupted, to take matters forward. The agenda provided by the Expert Group should be a good basis for doing so. ...

Trade Policy

Recalling the Vancouver Declaration on World Trade [see p 354, 1987], *Heads of Government emphasised the importance of an open and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system for sustaining non-inflationary world growth. Noting that countries had not shared evenly in expanding world trade, they deplored continuing protectionism, which was particularly damaging to some exports from developing countries. There were major costs where protection had been substantial and persistent, as in agriculture and textiles. They deeply regretted the growing recourse by some major developed countries to unilateral action and bilateral pressures to settle international trade disputes.*

Heads of Government noted that this was the last Heads of Government Meeting before the conclusion of the Uruguay Round. They expressed their concern with current progress and emphasised the need to ensure a balance between industrial and developing countries. They called on all participants in the Uruguay Round negotiations to work to secure its objectives and implement commitments made at Punta del Este and build on those at the Mid-term Review [see pp 328-9, 1986, and p 27]. *The Round's failure would have severe consequences for the world economy and the developing countries in particular. They emphasised the crucial importance of rapid and substantive progress to produce a conclusion by the end of 1990 that was balanced and meaningful; strengthened the role of GATT* [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] *and preserved the multilateral trading system; and led to further liberalisation and expansion of world trade, benefiting all countries, especially developing countries. They requested the Secretary-General to continue to provide appropriate levels of technical support to member governments during the Uruguay Round's concluding phase, including an evaluation of the Round's results.*

Commodities

Heads of Government expressed concern at the negative impact on developing countries of weak and unstable commodity prices. ...

Heads of Government acknowledged that the contribution of international commodity agreements to the aim of reducing price and earnings fluctuations had recently been very disappointing, with the notable exception of rubber. They believed that action was required on several fronts, including enhanced market access for commodities in processed and unprocessed forms, and product development. ... They agreed that renewed attention should be given to strengthening compensatory financing arrangements.

Debt and Financial Flows

Heads of Government gave special attention to the continuing problem of developing country indebtedness and welcomed recent steps, especially the agreement reached in Toronto and the Brady Plan [see p 233, 1988, and p 184], *to reduce debt and debt-service, recognising that many developing countries faced great difficulties in growing out of debt. Special assistance should continue to be given to countries which are genuinely not in a position to repay their debts. They also stressed that the resource needs of countries which had been servicing their debt fully under difficult circumstances should be taken into account.*

They welcomed the steps taken by a number of aid donors to write off debts stemming from past development assistance.

Heads of Government noted the progress made under the Toronto initiative for the poorest debt-distressed countries. They called for a further strengthening of these efforts, and for the initiative to cover other countries in similar circumstances outside Sub-Saharan Africa. They also emphasised the continuing need for action to reduce the commercial debt of low-income debt-distressed countries.

Heads of Government believed that debt owed to multilateral institutions, which cannot be rescheduled, presented special problems. They agreed that ways be explored to assist those heavily indebted countries which have a large proportion of multilateral debt.

Heads of Government welcomed the current approach to the problem of countries in arrears to the IMF and the World Bank and commended the role played by Commonwealth countries in this process. They urged a continuation of this approach as well as adequate and timely donor finance.

Heads of Government regretted the severe contraction of financial flows to developing countries, and for several countries, a negative net transfer of resources. They emphasised the importance of efforts to increase all flows. In particular, they called for a renewed commitment and effort to meet the United Nations ODA [official development assistance] *target.*[1] ...

Poverty Alleviation

Heads of Government recognised the possible adverse social consequences of adjustment policies and their implications for the viability of democratic institutions and political stability. They recognised the need to pay more attention to the social costs of adjustment and their impact on vulnerable groups. They welcomed the World Bank's recent focus on poverty alleviation in its lending policies and also noted the IMF's concern in this respect. They called

[1] Official development assistance is an international reporting concept and comprises official aid flows having a grant (concessional) element of 25 per cent or more, and certain other contributions. The UN General Assembly called in 1970 for net official development to be at least 0·7 per cent of a country's gross national product at market prices.

on governments and international institutions to mitigate the painful consequences of adjustment through careful and well targeted programmes for poverty alleviation.

Equity Fund

Heads of Government noted that at their recent meeting in Kingston Commonwealth Finance Ministers had welcomed the proposal to launch a Commonwealth Equity Fund. They noted with approval the Secretariat's catalytic role in preparing the Fund in the last year. They further noted that, for the future, it was proposed that full executive responsibility for the Fund would be carried by commercial interests, who would therefore bear all financial and legal obligations for it. In these circumstances, they reaffirmed the warm welcome of Finance Ministers for an initiative which will facilitate the flow of private institutional investment to Commonwealth developing countries and which will seek out potential investment opportunities in small and low income countries. They considered that Commonwealth governments could review sympathetically relevant national provisions which affect the operations of the Fund in their countries. They looked forward to an early launch of the Fund. . . .

Management of Technological Change

Heads of Government took note of the fact that technological change was continuing at a rapid pace and that great attention to science and technology management was a requirement of all countries. In this connection they reiterated their support for the activities the Secretariat was undertaking in pursuing the recommendations of the Report, Technological Change: Enhancing the Benefits, *which had been presented to their Nassau Meeting.*[1]

Heads of Government endorsed the Malaysian Government's proposal for the establishment of a Commonwealth Consultative Group for Technology Management (CCGTM) . . . with a small support unit within the Secretariat. They noted that this unit . . . would enable the Secretariat to provide an advisory service to governments, with particular reference to technology and environment assessment and management, and the inter-relationship between these issues and economic policy. . . .

Women and Structural Adjustment

Heads of Government discussed the report Engendering Adjustment for the 1990s, *prepared by the Expert Group on Women and Structural Adjustment, which they had established at their Vancouver Meeting* [see p 350, 1987]. *They expressed great appreciation for the work of the Group. While accepting the need for structural adjustment, they were concerned that economic and adjustment difficulties in several countries were adversely affecting the already disadvantaged position of women.*

Heads of Government commended for serious consideration the approach to adjustment recommended in the Report, designed to protect and support the vital roles women perform in society. They stressed the importance of adopting policies which facilitate women's full participation in public and private sectors. Emphasising the urgent need to redress the socio-economic inequities facing women, they stressed the importance of the total integration of women into the development process, including equitable access to education, training, credit, land and employment.

Heads of Government commended the Report for serious consideration, particularly the six general areas highlighted for action by governments, international agencies and NGOs [non-governmental organisations]. *They endorsed the recommendation for more intensive and early discussion of the Report at regional levels and for the Commonwealth to promote an intergovernmental meeting, involving relevant international institutions, to focus on broader adjustment strategies which take into account the needs of women. They recommended that Commonwealth Ministers Responsible for Women's Affairs give further consideration to the Report at their meeting in Ottawa in October, 1990.*

Child Survival, Protection and Development

Heads of Government welcomed the progress being made for the survival, protection and development of the child, especially with the support of UNICEF [United Nations Children's Fund] *and WHO* [World Health Organisation]. *They called on member countries to support the concept of "Adjustment with a Human Face", in order to protect investment in social sectors such as health and education. They also noted that most major health problems and premature deaths are preventable through changes in human behaviour and effective and low-cost actions for child survival and development, such as immunisation and oral rehydration therapy, which are already saving millions of young lives worldwide.*

Heads of Government called for the adoption of a United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. . . .

Environment and Climatic Change

Heads of Government . . . discussed the subject of climate change on the basis of the Commonwealth Expert Group's Report. They asked the Secretary-General to identify a group of experts on the environment who could monitor and evaluate developments concerning climate change . . . [and] *noted with appreciation the generous offer from the President of Guyana to set aside part of Guyana's Amazonian tropical forest for a pilot project under Commonwealth auspices to study utilisation of the forest on a sustainable basis and the conservation of species. They asked the Secretary-General to organise a high level exploratory mission to pursue the offer with the Guyanese authorities.*

Heads of Government welcomed the invitation from the Prime Minister of Australia to developing Commonwealth countries to participate in a technical assistance programme to provide training for assessing the effects of climate change on rural land productivity. . . .

Heads of Government also welcomed the announcement that, to mark the Fortieth Anniversary of the modern Commonwealth, Canada will offer 40 scholarships a year for five years as an additional contribution to the CFTC [Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation]. *In recognition of the adoption of the Langkawi Declaration, Canada suggested that these scholarships could*

[1] In 1985.

most appropriately be dedicated to environmental studies.

Heads of Government noted the positive role which NGOs (including the Commonwealth Human Ecology Council) and others could play in maintaining and increasing awareness of environmental issues, in particular climate change. They encouraged the development and strengthening of consultative arrangements between NGOs and governments to help in clarifying environmental issues.

Heads of Government asked the Secretariat to strengthen its ability to assist governments, on request, in the environmental field through policy development work, and through CFTC technical assistance, so as to give effect to the Programme of Action of the Langkawi Declaration. They requested the Managing Director of the CFTC to report to the next Commonwealth Senior Officials Meeting on the extent of support which can be offered through the CFTC to programmes which address environmental concerns. ...

Regional Economic Co-operation

Heads of Government noted the progress towards a Single Market in the European Community (EC) in 1992 and strengthened free trade between Canada and the United States which would encourage economic expansion in member countries, and, through their trade generating potential, could have a favourable impact on the world at large. They acknowledged, however, that there could be dangers in the growing regionalisation of trade through the establishment of trading blocs. They cautioned against the possible diversion of trade as well as increased trade restrictions against third countries, particularly developing countries. ... They ... welcomed the assurance from the British Government that it would endeavour to maintain access into the EC for exports from Commonwealth countries. ...

Heads of Government looked forward to a successful outcome of the renegotiation of the Lomé Convention [see pp 96-7]. *They called on the EC to agree changes to the Convention which would improve trade and financial flows between the ACP* [Africa, Caribbean and Pacific] *Group and the EC. Account should be taken of the interests of Commonwealth developing countries outside the ACP. ...*

Other Matters

The communiqué covered a number of other matters discussed by the heads of Government. They welcomed the advances in the Central American peace process and also welcomed efforts to strengthen regional co-operation in the Caribbean. They reiterated the position regarding Cyprus that they had adopted at the Vancouver meeting in 1987 (see pp 346-7, 1987) and called on all parties to co-operate fully with the UN Secretary-General in his efforts towards achieving a just solution there. They called for the long-delayed UN Conference on the Implementation of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace to be convened not later than 1990 and for the Conference to take practical steps. They acknowledged the importance of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (see p 128, 1987) as a disarmament measure.

Heads of Government also called on all states to protect and conserve Antarctica. They welcomed the increased support given by the IMF, the World Bank and bilateral donors for structural adjustment. They expressed serious concern at the deteriorating socio-economic condition of the Least Developed Countries.[1] They also called for national and international action programmes to provide adequate shelter for all by the year 2000.

COMMONWEALTH FUNCTIONAL CO-OPERATION

In a separate communiqué, heads of Government reaffirmed the value they placed on functional co-operation as 'a vital element in Commonwealth collective endeavours'.

Drugs

The Secretariat was asked to continue its work of organising training in such areas as customs and law enforcement, investigative methods, education, and treatment and rehabilitation of addicts, in collaboration with the relevant UN agencies.

Education

Heads of Government expressed their satisfaction with the work of the Commonwealth of Learning, established in 1988.[2] A wide range of collaborative activities has been initiated and a data base is being built up. The heads of Government also called for increased contributions to its budget.

The Report of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation was welcomed. It proposes that Commonwealth governments should establish a collaborative support scheme to strengthen key aspects of higher education development, particularly books, learning materials and libraries, management and staff development, and information technology. The Commonwealth Secretary-General was requested to convene a meeting of principal donor agencies and selected representatives from developing countries to consider the possibilities in more detail and to submit a report for consideration by the next conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers in 1990. Heads of Government expressed great concern at the Standing Committee's evidence showing that intra-Commonwealth student mobility continued to decline and they invited the principal host countries to consider how to reverse this trend.

Human Rights

Heads of Government requested the Secretary-General to convene a governmental working group of experts on human rights. This

[1]The term 'Least Developed Country' is an international definition first recognised by the second UN Conference on Trade and Development in 1968 and the UN General Assembly in 1971. The qualification is based on per capita gross domestic product (GDP), the share of manufacturing industry in total GDP, and literacy levels. Over 40 countries are now classed as Least Developed Countries.

[2]The Commonwealth of Learning is an institution for co-operation in distance education. It came into being in 1988 and its headquarters are in Vancouver, Canada, making it the first Commonwealth organisation with its headquarters outside Britain. Britain is developing the information and documentation unit at the Open University in Milton Keynes, which will hold information on academic credits to facilitate their transfer.

would be charged with the responsibility of reviewing Commonwealth co-operation in this matter at present and recommending possible avenues for enhanced co-operation and action in the future in such areas as education, training and technical assistance upon request of member states. These recommendations would be made to the Secretary-General and, where appropriate, to the next Commonwealth heads of Government meeting.

Other Matters

Heads of Government also discussed the work of the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation and agreed on the importance of strengthening and expanding its technical assistance and training activities and of ensuring that it was able to meet existing demands and new challenges. They recognised that more sustained efforts were needed to meet the needs of women in the development process. Other subjects discussed were Commonwealth scientific co-operation, which it was recognised could make an important contribution to the development process; the Commonwealth Youth Programme; the Commonwealth Games, which are to be held in Auckland in 1990; the Commonwealth Trade Union Council; the Commonwealth Foundation; the Commonwealth Institute; Commonwealth budgets and the accommodation needs of the Secretariat.

British-Argentine Relations

Following a meeting in Madrid between 17 and 19 October, Britain and Argentina have agreed to establish consular relations and to resume air and maritime communications.

At the Madrid meeting, which followed talks in New York in August (see pp 345-6), the British delegation was led by the British Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Sir Crispin Tickell, and the Argentine delegation by the Argentine Special Representative, Sr. Lucio Garcia del Solar.

Joint Statement

In a joint statement issued after the talks both Governments stressed that nothing in the conduct or content of the Madrid meeting should be interpreted as a change in the position of either Government regarding sovereignty or territorial and maritime jurisdiction over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands.

Britain and Argentina confirmed their commitment to respect fully the principles of the United Nations Charter, in particular their obligations to settle disputes exclusively by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force.

Ending of Hostilities

Noting that all hostilities had ceased between them, both Governments undertook not to pursue any claim against each other, including nationals of the other, in respect of loss or damage arising from the hostilities and all other actions in or around the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands before 1989.

Consular Relations

Britain and Argentina agreed to resume consular relations and reaffirmed 'their wish to normalise relations between their two countries with a view to resuming diplomatic relations and agreed to include the question of diplomatic relations on the agenda for their next meeting'.

Confidence Building

To build mutual confidence and avoid military incidents, both countries agreed to set up a working group to consider proposals and to report to their respective governments, with the aim of considering the issue at the next substantive meeting. In the meantime, Britain said that, at an early date, it would dispense with the requirement of prior agreement for Argentine merchant shipping wishing to enter the 150-mile protection zone around the Falkland Islands; Britain is also to align the limits of the protection zone with those of the fisheries conservation zone (see pp 351-2, 1986) around the Islands.

Economic Relations

Both Governments affirmed their desire to promote commercial and financial relations and agreed to lift all remaining economic restrictions imposed since 1982.[1] In the light of this, Britain agreed to facilitate the establishment of co-operative links between Argentina and the European Community.

The British delegation announced that the Export Credit Guarantee Department would make available short-term cover for British exporters to Argentina under irrevocable letters of credit from Argentine banks. It also stated that a trade mission organised by the Latin American Trade Advisory Group of the British Overseas Trade Board would visit Argentina from 27 November to 1 December with the financial support of the Department of Trade and Industry. This proposed visit was welcomed by the Argentine delegation.

It was agreed that air and maritime communications should be resumed between Britain and Argentina and that their respective civil aviation authorities should be invited to open negotiations.

The establishment of a working group on fisheries, to make proposals for exchanges of information, for measures of co-operation and for conservation measures, was also agreed.

Other Issues

Both delegations exchanged views on contacts between the Falkland Islands and the continental mainland and agreed on the benefit of developing such links and to keep the matter under review. They also looked forward to the further development of cultural, scientific and sporting relations and

[1] In April 1982 imports from Argentina were banned following the invasion of the Falkland Islands (see pp 105-7, 1982) and Argentine assets in Britain were frozen. Argentina imposed a ban on British imports and other financial restrictions. In September 1982 Britain unfroze the Argentine assets and in July 1985 lifted the ban on the import of Argentine goods. In August 1989 Argentina stopped discriminating against British imports and, as a result of the Madrid talks, lifted all its financial restrictions.

expressed the hope that a new cultural agreement could be concluded.

It was agreed to hold another meeting in Madrid on 14 and 15 February 1990.

British Statement

Commenting on the talks in a radio interview on 20 October, the then Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr John Major, said that Britain had achieved some important objectives without any prejudice to its position regarding sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. He welcomed the progress made, but said that there was still a lot to do before full diplomatic relations could be resumed. The reduction of tension would be very much welcomed by the Falkland Islanders, who would appreciate Britain's position on sovereignty and the fact that Argentina had affirmed that it would not use force.

Chancellor's Mansion House Speech

The need for monetary policy to take into account indicators additional to the monetary base – including the exchange rate – was pointed out by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr Nigel Lawson, in his speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet for Bankers and Merchants of the City of London at the Mansion House on 19 October. Mr Lawson also said that interest rates would need to remain high for some time. He rejected the idea of credit controls.

Monetary Policy

Monetary policy, Mr Lawson[1] began, was at the heart of macroeconomic policy in a free economy and played the central role in the battle against inflation. The key to operating a sound monetary policy was to take correct and timely decisions on interest rates. There were two indicators, in particular, which the Government used in reaching these decisions: the monetary base (narrow money [M0][2]) and the exchange rate.

M0, which had been targeted continuously since 1984, had consistently exhibited a stable relationship with gross domestic product (GDP) in money terms, which was the essential requirement of any intermediate target. The key to sound macroeconomic policy was to focus on the path of money GDP and thus on inflation itself. So it was important to keep M0 within its published target range. But, for two reasons, policy could not be based on M0 alone. First, it would be foolish to ignore other monetary conditions. Secondly, M0 was for the most part a coincident indicator and so gave little early warning of future inflationary pressures.

In an increasingly integrated world, the exchange rate was both a key indicator of monetary conditions and a most important part of the transmission mechanism through which monetary policy affected inflation. The Government had, therefore, always assigned it a major role in the assessment of monetary conditions. 'We cannot allow the necessary rigour of monetary policy to be undermined by exchange rate weakness. This means that interest rates will have to remain high for some time to come', Mr Lawson warned.

Broad money used to be considered a useful leading indicator, he continued, but for the past ten years had proved an unreliable guide. Had monetary policy been set on the basis of broad money targets alone over this period, it would have generated a series of erratic and often perverse changes of tack. The latest figures for broad money and lending flew in the face of clear evidence that policy was biting and that money demand was slowing.

Interest rates were the essential instrument of monetary policy and so Mr Lawson rejected a return to credit controls. Such a step would be unattractive in itself because of the distortions and inefficiencies it would create. More fundamentally, it was simply not a serious option in today's highly competitive and open financial markets and in the absence of exchange controls.[1]

Debt Management

The purpose of government debt management, Mr Lawson continued, was to ensure that the public sector neither injected liquidity into the economy nor extracted liquidity from it. In recent years the tightness of fiscal policy had meant that, instead of funding a borrowing requirement, the Government was defunding – or unfunding – a debt repayment. So there had been reverse auctions of government stock (gilt-edged securities – see pp 26-7) and the Bank of England had regularly purchased – rather than sold – gilt-edged in the secondary market. But the principle remained unaltered: to ensure that the Government conducted its financial affairs so as to have a broadly neutral effect on liquidity.

Some observers had argued that this principle be set aside in favour of a return to the practice of deliberate overfunding in order to control broad money, as had been practised for periods earlier in the 1980s. Mr Lawson rejected this course of action as any money drained out of the system by selling gilt-edged over and above the Government's funding requirements or by buying in less than these requirements dictated would simply have to be injected into the system elsewhere. Otherwise, the outcome would be higher interest rates than those the authorities considered necessary.

Mr Lawson explained that overfunding had been abandoned in 1985 as it was creating distortions in the financial markets, which were undesirable in themselves and which made policy harder to operate. The practice of full funding avoided such dis-

[1] Mr Lawson resigned as Chancellor on 26 October (see p 403).

[2] Notes and coin in circulation with the public and banks' holdings of cash and their operational balances at the Bank of England.

[1] The Economic Secretary to the Treasury, Mr Richard Ryder, speaking on 30 October, said that past attempts to restrain bank lending and hire purchase outlays had been evaded. He also stressed that increasing financial sophistication and the abolition of exchange controls had served to undermine credit controls.

tortions. It also meant that, as the Government reduced its debt, it made space for other borrowers in the market for sterling bonds. Since the beginning of 1988-89 the value of gilt-edged on issue had fallen by £13,000 million while over £16,000 million of other sterling bonds had been issued.

However, the Government was not seeking to implement the full fund rule rigidly month by month or even year by year. While it remained the policy to ensure that, over time, any net intervention was sterilised, that would be done as and when appropriate and not necessarily within the financial year in which the intervention occurred. Intervention was by its nature a short-term operation; it would clearly be foolish to blunt its impact by simultaneously reinjecting liquidity into the system. Given the extent of recent intervention, some overfunding was likely in the current financial year, which would be carried over and reversed thereafter.

Mr Lawson went on to announce that, in an attempt to reduce the number of gilt-edged issues but to enhance their marketability, there would be an experimental conversion of a pair of stocks.[1] Depending on the response, other conversion offers might follow.

Economic and Monetary Union

Mr Lawson reiterated the Government's commitment to stage 1 of the Delors report on economic and monetary union (see p 271). However, the Government parted company with the report in its prescriptions for what should follow stage 1 and so would be suggesting an alternative that was market-based and evolutionary (see pp 408-9).

British Economy

Turning to the British economy, Mr Lawson said that the past eight years had been a period of almost unprecedented expansion, culminating in the unexpected – and unsustainable – growth spurt of 1987 and 1988. The subsequent slowing in the pace of economic activity had not happened as quickly as Mr Lawson had expected; in particular, personal savings had fallen further than forecast. However, the slowing was clearly under way and had a long way to go before the economy resumed its long-term upward trend. During this necessary adjustment process, inflation would gradually abate and the deficit on the current account of the balance of payments would gradually narrow although only over a period of time.

Concluding, Mr Lawson said that, in the historical perspective, what would stand out about this period would not be the short-term vagaries of the economic cycle but the long-term improvement in the supply performance of the British economy. This was seen in the quantity and quality of business investment and the greatly improved productivity and profitability of industry. 'The people of Britain may have temporarily forgotten the habit of thrift. That is undoubtedly a short-term problem. But at the same time they have rediscovered the spirit of enterprise. And that is the greatest prize of all.'

[1]On 20 October the Bank of England announced that owners of 9¾ per cent Conversion Stock 2006 could convert all or part of their holdings into 9 per cent Treasury Loan 2008 on the basis of £100 of the first stock for £105 of the second. On 14 November the Bank announced that, of the £702 million of Conversion Stock outstanding prior to the offer, acceptances had been received to convert £687 million (98 per cent of the total) into Treasury Loan.

Unofficial Industrial Action

Government proposals for legislative changes to extend trade union responsibility for unofficial industrial action were set out in a Green Paper published on 11 October.

The Green Paper[1] says that the reform of industrial relations since 1979 has made an important contribution to the improvement in Britain's economic performance.[2] In the three years ended July 1989 the annual average number of days lost through industrial disputes was 3·6 million, compared with an annual average of 12·9 million in the 1970s. However, the industrial relations system 'still suffers from a substantial amount of unofficial action', industrial action taken by trade union members but not authorised or endorsed by their trade union. Most unofficial strikes arise over local issues which have not been taken through the agreed procedures for dealing with disputes and they tend to be 'sudden, unpredictable and disruptive', making them particularly damaging to business. They can also have a serious effect on many firms and the public, who may have no involvement with the particular issue in dispute.

Extent of Unofficial Action

The Green Paper says that the majority of strikes in Great Britain are unofficial, and these are 'a cause of unpredictable economic damage and inconvenience to the public'. Over 500,000 working days were lost through unofficial action in 1987 and nearly 1·5 million in 1988. A broad categorisation of stoppages covered by official statistics on industrial disputes shows that three-quarters of those which could be classified were unofficial. In addition, there were numerous small and unofficial strikes not included in the available statistics.

Examples of industries affected by unofficial action include coal, motor manufacturing and the docks (the last most recently in 1989 following the Government's announcement of the abolition of the Dock Labour Scheme – see pp 192-4). In addition, essential public services have been the target of unofficial action, which in some cases has caused 'widespread hardship to the community'. Recent examples have included unofficial stoppages on the railways and London Underground. 'Such action is often deliberately targeted on the public in order to put pressure on the employer.'

In other countries the incidence of unofficial strikes is, in general, very low, and the Green Paper says that 'in a number of important cases this is a consequence of statutory constraints'. For example,

[1]*Unofficial Action and the Law: Proposals to Reform the Law Affecting Unofficial Industrial Action*. Cm 821. Department of Employment. HMSO, £3. ISBN 0 10 108212 6.

[2]For more detailed information on the changes in individual relations legislation see COI reference paper *Industrial Relations in Britain*, No 187/89.

in the United States unofficial strikes are generally unlawful, while in some European countries unofficial strikes are illegal and there is no protection against dismissal for unofficial strikers.

Trade Union Responsibility

The Employment Acts of 1980, 1982 and 1988 and the Trade Union Act 1984 have restricted statutory immunities in order to provide a remedy against some of the most damaging and disruptive forms of industrial action. Trade unions have immunity only for organising industrial action in furtherance or contemplation of a lawful trade dispute. A trade union is potentially liable for unlawful inducement of industrial action which has been authorised or endorsed, except where the official or committee concerned was forbidden from doing so by the union's rules or the act has been repudiated by the union's executive committee, general secretary or president. However, unofficial action is subject to fewer constraints than official action. The Green Paper says that unofficial action may be seen by the union as a useful means of putting pressure on an employer and 'in some circumstances a union may even formally repudiate unofficial action, where the law requires this to be done to avoid responsibility, confident that its members will ignore the repudiation because they believe the union is not really averse to the action they are organising or taking'. Existing legislative provisions leave open the possibility of unofficial action being organised by lay officers (such as workplace representatives, sometimes called 'shop stewards') or by officials who are forbidden by the union's rules from authorising or endorsing industrial action. When a union acquiesces in unofficial action taken in this way, the effect is that it escapes responsibility and avoids the need to fulfil certain requirements which come into being if the union organises the action, for example, the need to hold a secret ballot.

Accordingly, the Government believes that the law should be changed so that a union would be made potentially liable for inducement of industrial action by any official (including those not employed by the union, for example, shop stewards) or any committee unless the union repudiated the inducement. It is proposing to strengthen the tests that a union must satisfy to avoid legal liability. It would have to repudiate unequivocally the inducement and communicate this in writing individually to all the members concerned. Alternatively, it would be open to the union to accept liability for the industrial action, in which case it would need to hold a proper secret ballot of all its relevant members.

Unofficial Strikers

Strikes, whether official or unofficial, nearly always involve each striker in a breach of his or her contract of employment. However, the Green Paper points out that the law on unfair dismissal has put restrictions on the ability of employers to dismiss employees who break their contracts of employment in a strike. 'These restrictions operate in a way which is anomalous and which in particular limits the ability of an employer to take effective action against persistent unofficial action.' The effect is that, to avoid the risk of complaints of unfair dismissal, an employer must dismiss all of the workforce who go on strike or none at all, while when re-engaging any of those dismissed within three months all must be rehired or the employer is open to an action for unfair dismissal from those who have not been re-employed.

The Government is proposing that the restrictions on selective dismissal or re-engagement should be modified so that an employee dismissed while participating in unofficial industrial action would be unable to claim unfair dismissal before an industrial tribunal. In addition, it is proposing to remove the statutory immunities available for organising industrial action where one of the reasons for the action is to bring pressure on an employer in support of anyone dismissed while taking unofficial action.

Railway Safety

The Government and British Rail are taking action to deal with the recommendations to improve railway safety contained in the report of the inspector into the major railway accident at Clapham Junction (south London) on 12 December 1988.

Report of the Investigation

The investigation into the causes and circumstances of the accident was conducted by Sir Anthony Hidden, QC, and his report was published on 7 November.[1] The accident, in which a crowded commuter train ran into the rear of a stationary train and then veered into the path of a third oncoming train, resulted in 35 deaths, while nearly 500 people were injured, 69 of them seriously. The report concludes that the accident was caused by faulty wiring carried out during a major investment programme to modernise signalling on the lines into Waterloo. As a result, a faulty signal turned from green to red as a train passed it and the driver stopped to report this; the signal then reverted to green, allowing the following train to pass the signal and to run into the rear of the first train.

Sir Anthony makes 93 recommendations to British Rail, the Government and the emergency services. They are designed to seek to prevent another similar accident by addressing the causes, to promote a better safety culture within British Rail, and to mitigate the effects of any future accident. Sir Anthony says that he is 'encouraged by the fact that much has already been done towards meeting some of these recommendations'. Among the recommendations are:

– improved wiring installation procedures, testing of resignalling work and improvements to training, for example that British Rail should give technical training to ensure that efficient and safe practices are carried out by all technical staff;

– monitoring by British Rail to ensure that no individual works excessive overtime;

– action to ensure that sufficient numbers of skilled staff are retained and recruited to match work requirements safely;

[1] *Investigation into the Clapham Junction Railway Accident.* Cm 820. Department of Transport. HMSO, £16·50. ISBN 0 10 108202 9.

– speedy implementation of British Rail's 'Total Quality Management Initiative', to ensure that poor working practices are eliminated;

– higher priority for the introduction of on-train data recorders (also known as 'black boxes') to assist investigation of any future incident;

– priority for the implementation by British Rail of a system of radio communication between the driver and the signalman on all traction units, with a sufficient number of radio frequencies being allocated for this purpose;

– higher priority for the implementation of automatic train protection (which provides an audible warning in the cab of the aspect of the signal ahead), with full implementation of a system within five years of its selection and with priority going to densely operated lines;

– a study by the Department of Transport and British Rail of appraisal procedures for safety elements of investment proposals;

– the completion of British Rail's programme of research into the structural integrity of its rolling stock by April 1991, with the results being discussed with the Railway Inspectorate to obtain the latter's agreement to the structural changes necessary to strengthen all relevant rolling stock with a subsequent life of eight years and over;

– monitoring by British Rail of possible overcrowding, to ensure that overall train loading criteria are achieved, with these criteria being kept under review by the Department of Transport and British Rail;

– improved communication between the emergency services; and

– improvements to British Rail's response to an accident, for example, in communications and emergency planning.

Government Response

In a statement in the House of Commons on 7 November (*Hansard*, Vol 159, No 169, cols 837-8), the Secretary of State for Transport, Mr Cecil Parkinson, said that he had asked British Rail to deal promptly with all the recommendations addressed to it and to report to him on their implementation within three months. Many recommendations were based on British Rail's suggestions or on the conclusions of its internal inquiry. Action had already been taken to implement them, although in some cases the report recommended faster implementation. British Rail was 'already committed to two important new developments, automatic train protection and the installation of cab radios' [where British Rail has modified its plan to ensure that all units are fitted by 1992]. To ensure that British Rail had sufficient frequencies to operate cab radio effectively, the Government was allocating it five new frequencies, with access to two more. British Rail had anticipated some of the additional cost of implementing the report in its expenditure plans and, said Mr Parkinson, he had fully endorsed this provision. British Rail would need to consider whether further expenditure was required, and he said that financial cost would not stand in the way of the implementation of the report.

Mr Parkinson said that he had written to the chairmen of London Regional Transport and the passenger transport executives to ask them, where appropriate, to consider their own rail systems in the light of the report, and to indicate their proposals for implementing the relevant recommendations within three months.

Turning to the inspector's recommendations addressed to the Government, the Secretary of State said that the report had recommended that railway legislation should be reviewed and the powers of the Railway Inspectorate (which dealt with railway safety) widened and clarified. The necessary legislation would be introduced as soon as a suitable opportunity arose. Meanwhile, most of the changes could be implemented by administrative action and, where this had not occurred, he had asked that action should be taken urgently. Additional railway inspectors were being recruited, and numbers expanded as necessary, to ensure that the Railway Inspectorate had sufficient staff to implement the report. On investment, plans submitted to him for approval already included a specific section on safety issues. The Department of Transport would discuss with British Rail possible further improvements.

On the recommendations affecting the Department of Health, Mr Parkinson said that the Secretary of State for Health had already introduced a review of the National Health Service's response to major incidents, with a view to preparing revised guidelines, and the Department had accepted the inspector's other recommendations.

The Global Environment

In a wide-ranging speech concerning global environmental issues, given to the United Nations General Assembly in New York on 8 November, the Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, announced that Britain would be establishing a new centre for the prediction of climate change. She called for a convention on global climate change to be set up by 1992 and also for one on the conservation of plant and animal life. Britain would give a further £100 million in aid to help manage and preserve the tropical forests. Other British environmental assistance was outlined by the Minister for Overseas Development, Mrs Lynda Chalker, in a speech earlier in the month. Britain has also supported measures to safeguard the Antarctic environment.

PRIME MINISTER'S ADDRESS

The Prime Minister said that the threat to the global environment – the prospect of irretrievable damage to the atmosphere, to the oceans and to the earth itself – had become one of the most urgent and important of all the challenges faced by the world community.

Mankind and its activities were changing the environment of the planet on an unprecedented scale, and the main threat to the environment now came

from 'the sheer numbers of people and the plants and animals that go with them'. The annual increase in the amount of carbon dioxide (a 'greenhouse' gas – see p 105) reaching the atmosphere was three billion tonnes, while tropical forests, which removed carbon dioxide from the air, were being rapidly destroyed. At the present rate of clearance 65 per cent of forests in the humid tropical zones would be removed by the year 2000.

Great damage was also being done to the ozone layer by the production of halons and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), although it had now been recognised that reducing and eventually eliminating the emission of CFCs was one positive step which could be taken towards reducing the accumulation of greenhouse gases (see pp 105 and 240-1). The latest scientific evidence on damage to the environment, such as that from the British Antarctic Survey (reporting severe spring ozone depletion and significant thinning of the sea ice), and from the Meteorological Office's study on the Amazon rainforest (showing that large-scale deforestation may reduce rainfall), were 'sobering indications' of the dangers that lay ahead.

The Scope for International Action

The Prime Minister said that in some areas, such as the pollution of rivers, the improvement of agricultural methods, and the use of nuclear power – the most environmentally safe form of energy – action could be taken primarily by individual nations or groups of nations. However, the problem of global climate change[1] was one that affected everyone and action would only be effective if taken at international level. It was necessary to have the best possible scientific assessment before acting, and Britain was co-ordinating such an assessment within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (see p 410). The assessment would be available by the time of the second world climate conference in 1990.

However, there was a need to expand the capacity to model and predict climate change, which was why Britain would be establishing a new centre for the prediction of climate change. The centre would provide advanced computing facilities and be open to experts from all over the world, especially from the developing countries. [The first major goal of the centre will be the completion of an updated model of climate change by 1993. The budget for the centre in 1990-91 will be over £5·5 million, with similar funding in succeeding years.]

At the same time, it was necessary to have continued economic growth in order to generate the wealth required to pay for the protection of the environment; the tendency to blame modern multinational industry for the damage to the environment should be resisted. It was industry which would do the research and find the solutions. People were turning increasingly to environmentally safe products, and the market itself was acting as a corrective: the new safe products sold well while those which caused environmental damage were disappearing from the shelves.

A framework for international action should therefore be built on the basis of sound science and sound economics. New institutions were not needed, but those which already existed should be strengthened and improved, in particular the World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP – see p 240). Britain had recently more than doubled its contribution to UNEP (see p 106) and it urged others to do the same.

The most pressing task at the international level was to negotiate a framework convention on climate change on the model of that established by the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer in 1985 and the Montreal Protocol in 1987 (see p 240). These had established landmarks in international law, aiming to prevent rather than just to cure a global environmental problem. The aim should be to have a convention on global climate change prepared by the time the World Conference on Environment and Development met in 1992.

As well as the framework, there would need to be specific protocols on the different aspects of climate change, which would have to be binding, with effective regimes to supervise and monitor their application. Britain was proposing that the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change be prolonged beyond the submission of its report in 1990, so that it could provide an authoritative scientific base for the negotiation of the protocols. Then targets to reduce the greenhouse gases could be agreed.[1]

Mrs Thatcher also called for a further global convention to conserve the 'infinite variety' of plant and animal life which inhabited the planet. The disappearance of the tropical forests was doubly damaging in that they contained half the species in the world. Species which could perhaps help advance the frontiers of medical science were being lost 'at a reckless rate' – estimated to be between three and fifty a day.

Britain's Contribution

The Prime Minister outlined how Britain intended to contribute to the world effort to protect the environment (see also pp 107-9). Over the coming months the Government would be introducing a comprehensive system of pollution control to deal with industrial pollution to air, water and land (see pp 291, 1988, and 156-7). British industry was being encouraged to develop new technologies to clean up the environment and minimise waste, and Britain was aiming to recycle 50 per cent of its household waste by the end of the century.

The Government was drawing up an 'environmental agenda' for the decade ahead, which would cover energy, transport, agriculture and industry. A £2,000 million programme of improvements to reduce acid rain emissions from power stations had been begun (see p 247, 1988), and the role of non-

[1]For further information on global climate change see Documentation, p 439.

[1]At the Ministerial Conference on Atmospheric Pollution and Climate Change, held in the Netherlands on 6–7 November and attended by 70 countries, there was wide international agreement on the need for an early climate convention. The industrialised nations accepted the aim of stabilisation of their carbon dioxide emissions, and Britain agreed with the majority to aim to do so by the end of the century at the latest, but on a basis to be agreed in detail by the second world climate conference in 1990. It was also agreed to study the feasibility of a 20 per cent reduction in emissions by the industrialised nations by the year 2005.

fossil fuel sources, including nuclear, would be looked at more closely. Recent legislation had required companies supplying electricity positively to promote energy efficiency (see p 320). With regard to transport, the Government would be looking for ways to strengthen controls over vehicle emissions and to develop the lean-burn engine (see p 281), and the tax on lead-free petrol had already been reduced to encourage its use (see pp 281-2).

Farmers were being encouraged to reduce the intensity of their methods and to conserve wild-life habitats (see pp 240, 1988, and 60), and new woods and forests were being planted (see p 326). There had been a 50 per cent increase in tree planting in Britain in the last ten years. The Government was aiming to reduce chemical inputs to the soil and was bringing forward measures to deal with the problem of nitrates in water.

Britain was also increasing its investment in research into global environmental problems (see p 241), as well as supporting the contribution of its own scientists, for example, that of the British Antarctic Survey to the world ocean circulation experiment (see pp 280-1).

To help poorer countries cope with their environmental problems, Britain was assisting 20 countries to manage and preserve their tropical forests, and had recently signed agreements with India and Brazil (see pp 186 and 309-10). In addition, Britain would commit a further £100 million bilaterally to tropical forestry activities over the next three years, mostly within the framework of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan (see p 411).

Conclusion

The Prime Minister concluded by urging every country to work through the United Nations and its agencies to secure worldwide agreements on ways to cope with the effects of climate change, the thinning of the ozone layer, and the loss of precious species. A realistic programme of action was needed, with an equally realistic timetable. Each country had to contribute and those countries which were industrialised should contribute more to help those who were not. The time had come to use reason to find a way to live with nature rather than to dominate it.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Speaking to the Welsh Centre for International Affairs on 3 November, Mrs Chalker reaffirmed Britain's support for the central message of the Brundtland Report (see pp 155-6, 1987) – 'the need for sustainable development based on a new era of economic growth and the integration of environment and development'.

For many developing countries environmental problems were acute. In 1988 Brazil had lost an area of tropical forest more extensive than the whole of the British Isles. It was no coincidence that Ethiopia's 'descent into acute vulnerability to famine' had followed the stripping of forest cover from its highlands, so that rain, when it did come, was not absorbed. Developed countries were beginning to realise that environmental problems affected everyone, and in these countries 'the political will is taking shape to tackle these problems'. Non-governmental organisations and other pressure groups in developing countries were echoing this message, and it was often local groups that had alerted the world to environmental problems – for example, in Brazil, regarding the destruction of the rainforests.

It was important to understand, Mrs Chalker said, that the developed countries were not seeking to deny affluence and growth to developing countries, but this had to be achieved on a sustainable basis. 'Growth is an essential component to any solution for environmental degradation. It provides the resources needed to tackle the causes. If environmental issues are properly tackled when appraising a project, the net additional cost of implementation may be small or there may be a net saving.'

The integration of economic and environmental issues was an important element in helping developing countries towards sustainable growth. There was plenty of work here for aid agencies, and the Minister set out Britain's environmental objectives:

1 To understand better the 'real costs and benefits of environmental actions'. The Overseas Development Administration had recently introduced a manual to help project managers to decide 'the degree of environmental assessment necessary for each project'.

2 To encourage the governments of developing countries to incorporate environmental concerns into their economic policies. Together with the World Bank, Britain was carrying out a study in Nepal to help the Government there 'to identify the links between major policy measures and environmental degradation'.

3 To provide more support for projects that benefited the environment. These included a forestry inventory and management project in Ghana to help that country to provide sustained yields of timber and prevent forest fires, illegal logging and encroachment on forest reserves. Britain had recently signed a memorandum of understanding with Brazil for the provision of help to the environment, including the Amazon rainforests (see pp 309-10).

4 To recognise the role that could be played by the private sector, given the right encouragement, particularly in transferring technologies.

5 To assist developing countries play their part in global environmental concerns. Britain would respond positively to developing countries' requests for assistance to protect the ozone layer, including research, re-equipping plants and examining the implications of strategies that did not use CFCs (see p 186). Britain had also made funds available to enable people from developing countries to participate in the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

6 To make full use of international agencies, such as the United Nations Environment Programme, but not at the cost of unnecessary bureaucracy or the creation of new funds that replicated those already in existence.

7 To make greater efforts to address 'the complex issues linking the use of our environment and other major economic issues, such as adequate living standards'. For example, intensive agriculture improved living standards but could mean loss of 'biological diversity' through such practices as

draining wetlands or felling forests. Problems could also arise from the use of inappropriate pesticides and from irrigation schemes that were badly managed. It was right to ask the developing countries to help preserve the environment, but they had a right to ask the developed countries to help: everyone would benefit.

ANTARCTICA

The protection of the Antarctic environment was one of the main topics discussed at the 15th Antarctic treaty consultative meeting held in Paris between 9 and 19 October.

Reporting on the meeting to the House of Commons on 1 November (Hansard, Vol 159, No 166, written answers, Cols 202-3), the Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Mr Tim Sainsbury, said that the meeting had 'adopted an unprecedented number and range of environmental recommendations'. These covered such issues as waste control; the prevention and control of, and response to, marine pollution; environmental monitoring; improved descriptions and management plans for specially protected areas; and new sites of special scientific interest. The meeting also discussed the role of Antarctica in understanding and monitoring global climate change and co-operation to improve scientific productivity in Antarctica. Of the 14 recommendations covered in this list, 12 resulted from the initiatives of, and close collaboration between, the British and United States delegations.

The meeting also considered proposals submitted by a number of delegations relating to comprehensive measures for the protection of the environment in Antarctica. Although none was endorsed by the meeting, it was agreed that meetings in 1990 would explore and discuss all proposals relating to the further elaboration, maintenance and effective implementation of a comprehensive system for the protection of the Antarctic environment; also to be considered are proposals on the regulation of Antarctic mineral resource activities concerning the issue of liability (see pp 307-9).

Expressing satisfaction with the results of the meeting, Mr Sainsbury said: 'The outcome . . . reinforced our view that the early entry into force of the minerals convention, with its strict environmental standards and procedures, remains an important objective as a necessary element in the overall system for protection of the Antarctic environment.'

Shorter Notes

MULTI-FIBRE ARRANGEMENT

A further report by Professor Aubrey Silberston on the Multi-Fibre Arrangement (MFA), the international arrangement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which regulates trade in textiles and clothing, has been published. Professor Silberston had been asked, in the light of developments since the publication of his first report in 1984 (see p 24, 1985), to assess the effects on the British economy of import restraints under the MFA and of barriers against British exports and to examine the economic effects of proposals for future developments of trade in textiles and clothing.

Under the MFA, the European Community negotiates bilateral agreements with major supplier countries. The first MFA came into effect in 1974; it has since been periodically re-negotiated and extended, and the present version (see p 277, 1986) runs until 1991. The aim of the MFA is to promote the orderly growth in trade, balancing the interests of exporting and importing countries. At the outset of the GATT Uruguay Round (see pp 328-9, 1986) GATT members committed themselves to the eventual re-integration of trade in textiles and clothing into GATT on the basis of strengthened GATT rules.

The report, the Minister for Corporate Affairs, Mr John Redwood, told the House of Commons on 19 October, considered how far liberalisation of the MFA would be likely to lead to increased competition from imports and examined the likely effects on Britain, particularly in terms of prices and employment. It also assessed the likely consequences of the single European market (see p 49) and the terms on which gradual liberalisation might be negotiated in the course of the Uruguay Round. The Government would welcome the views of interested parties and would take these into account in considering the position the Community should adopt for the negotiations.

Sources: *The Future of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement – Implications for the UK Economy* by Professor Z. A. Silberston. HMSO, £11·50. ISBN 0 11 515204 0; *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 156, written answers, cols 176-7.

BRITISH SHIPBUILDERS

The sale was announced on 26 September of Ferguson Shipbuilders in Port Glasgow to the HLD Group, which had been named as the preferred bidder for the facility in May. The Minister for Industry and Enterprise, Mr Douglas Hogg, welcomed the announcement, noting that the sale meant that all elements of British Shipbuilders previously owned by the Government, with the exception of Northeast Shipbuilders, had now been returned to the private sector (see pp 323-4). Mr Hogg said that he understood that the HLD Group aimed to continue the traditions of the yard, while seeking to diversify into other engineering fields.

Source: Department of Trade and Industry press notice, 26.9.89.

FOOD SAFETY

To focus its resources more effectively on maintaining the safety and quality of Britain's food supplies (see pp 275 and 316) the Government has set up a Food Safety Directorate, dividing food safety from food production responsibilities within the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. In addition, the

Government is setting up a consumer panel designed to give the public a direct means of conveying its views on food safety and consumer protection issues.

The Directorate, which will have a staff of about 700, will be presided over by Mr David Maclean, Parliamentary Secretary at the Ministry (see p 403). Its purpose will be to strengthen the Ministry's organisation for dealing with food safety issues by bringing together all the main aspects of food safety work for which it is responsible. It will consist of four main groups:

1 the food safety group, with responsibility for policy on food safety, including European Community issues, and on quality, including composition, labelling, additives, contaminants and new production processes;

2 the food science group, to provide the scientific background on food safety issues and with responsibility for the new Food Science Laboratory at Norwich (Norfolk), which will carry out analytical and research work in support of food policy in addition to that commissioned from other laboratories;

3 a third group to deal with pesticide safety approvals, veterinary medicines and biotechnology issues; and

4 a fourth group to deal with meat hygiene, animal health and related public health issues, and animal welfare.

The consumer panel, also to be chaired by Mr Maclean, will include representatives of the principal consumer bodies.

In a statement in the House of Commons on 2 November, the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Mr John Selwyn Gummer, stressed that 'the new arrangements do not diminish . . . the continuing need for advice from the existing expert and independent committees' which operate within the spheres of the Ministry and the Department of Health.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 159, No 167, written answers, cols 317-18; Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food press notice, 2.11.89.

FORESTRY

The Government has announced revised criteria for forestry planting on agricultural land in Scotland, reflecting recent government initiatives to encourage planting on better quality land. The annual planting target for Great Britain is now 33,000 hectares,[1] with an additional 12,000 hectares a year under the Farm Woodland Scheme (see pp 103 and 414-15, 1987, and p 67, 1988). The criteria take account of the continuing need to retain prime quality land in Scotland for agricultural use, and to protect the land necessary to maintain a thriving hill sheep farming industry.

They will allow, in appropriate circumstances, the release of non-prime arable land where forestry planting could play an important part in reducing agricultural surpluses and bring significant environmental benefits. Applications under the Woodland Grant Scheme (see p 62) and the Forestry Commission's land acquisitions would continue to be considered on their merits through the usual consultation procedures.

Introducing the revised criteria in the House of Commons on 24 October, the Secretary of State for Scotland, Mr Malcolm Rifkind, said that application needed to be made only for areas above 40 hectares. Consultation with the Scottish Office would be necessary in relation to land in respect of which agricultural grant had been paid within the previous two years and to land in Environmentally Sensitive Areas (see p 419, 1987).

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 162, written answers, cols 399-401; Scottish Office press notice, 24.10.89.

[For further information on forestry see COI reference paper *Forestry in Britain*, No 324/89.]

FAST REACTOR PROGRAMME

The Government has approved an application by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA) and British Nuclear Fuels plc for the construction of a demonstration fast reactor fuel reprocessing plant at Dounreay (Highland). Dounreay was chosen as the prospective site as it is already the centre for Britain's fast reactor development programme (see p 283, 1988). Because of planning and environmental implications, the application to Highland Regional Council in 1985 was referred to the Secretary of State for Scotland, Mr Malcolm Rifkind, who reached his decision after consideration of a report of a public local inquiry in 1986.

In a statement the UKAEA said that the plant would demonstrate the recycling of fast reactor fuel on a commercial scale and would enable Britain eventually to discuss with its European partners (France and the Federal Republic of Germany) the provision of reprocessing facilities within the European fast reactor programme – the design of a single demonstration reactor (with a possible start to construction in 1997). This programme would require reprocessing facilities on a larger scale than could be accommodated in existing prototype fast reactor reprocessing plants.

Dounreay's existing plant had demonstrated that plutonium and uranium could be recovered from irradiated fast reactor fuel safely and efficiently, with more than 99 per cent of the plutonium being recovered in usable form. By recycling their fuel in this way, fast reactors could extract 60 times more energy from a given quantity of uranium than other 'thermal' reactors.

Sources: Scottish Office press notice, 25.10.89; UKAEA press notice, 25.10.89.

RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY

The Severn Tidal Power Group (STPG) has published its report on the feasibility of a barrage across

[1] 1 hectare = 2.4711 acres.

the estuary of the river Severn (see p 244, 1988). The study has been jointly funded by the STPG, the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) and the Department of Energy at a cost of £4 million.

The Severn estuary, the report says, has one of the highest tidal ranges in the world. The 16 km (10 miles)-long barrage would largely comprise three types of reinforced concrete caissons: to house the 216 turbine generators divided between two power-houses; to contain the 166 sluices controlled by gates to let water through the barrage to fill the basin; and to provide links between the other caissons. The caissons would be floated to the site and sunk into position.

There would be embankments next to the Welsh and English shores (south of Cardiff [South Glamorgan] and south of Weston-super-Mare [Avon]), and approximately halfway across the estuary, near Steep Holm island. There would be an option for a dual-carriageway public road across the barrage, which would link to the main highway system on both shores, and for separate service roads for operation and maintenance access. Two large locks would allow passage to the biggest ships trading to the ports within the basin. Locks for small craft (inshore fishing vessels, pleasure craft and other boats) would be provided near each shore. Power would be transmitted by 400-kilovolt cables from the barrage to substations on both sides of the estuary, where it would be delivered into the national grid. Installed generating capacity would be 8,640 megawatts (MW).[1] The average annual output of electricity would be some 17 terawatt hours (TWh)[2] – 7 per cent of present energy consumption in England and Wales, and equivalent to a saving of 8 million tonnes of coal a year.

It is estimated that the pre-construction stage of the project would take five years and cost £190 million. Total capital cost (at April 1988 figures) of construction, about seven years on present indications, would be about £8,280 million.

It is expected that the barrage would boost the region's economy and generate a significant number of permanent jobs. Assessing the environmental effects of the barrage, the report says that further studies would be needed to reduce the uncertainties about the interaction between the estuary's flora and fauna, but indicates that the numbers of wading birds and wildfowl supported by the estuary are as likely to increase as decrease, while the diversity of species regularly found there is almost certain to increase. Fish and shrimp may increase in terms of both population size and range of species.

Announcing the report in the House of Commons on 23 October, the Minister of State for Energy, Mr Peter Morrison, stressed that further work, particularly on environmental, organisational and financial issues, would take some two years. 'As part of the privatisation and restructuring of the electricity supply industry [see pp 16-19]', he said, 'the Government are setting up arrangements which should be very attractive to suppliers of renewable sources of energy, but it will . . . be for the industry to determine the financial viability of each project.'

[1] 1 MW = 1,000 kilowatts.

[2] 1 TW = 1 million megawatts.

Sources: *The Severn Barrage Project: General Report*. Energy Paper No 57. Department of Energy, CEGB, STPG. HMSO, £13·95. ISBN 0 11 412952 5; *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 159, written answers, col 297.

MANCHESTER METROLINK

Government approval for a grant of 50 per cent of the cost of the first stage of the Manchester Metrolink light rail scheme was announced by the Minister of State for Transport, Mr Michael Portillo, in the House of Commons on 24 October. The first stage, which will cost £110 million, will link Manchester's main railway termini and provide improved services from Manchester to Bury and Altrincham as a result of the conversion of existing British Rail services to light rapid transit. The length of route will be about 31 km (19 miles), with 25 stations, of which five will be on the street-running section. Services, which are expected to start at the end of 1991 or early in 1992, will be operated by articulated electric vehicles consisting of two streamlined cars, and each vehicle will be able to carry 180 passengers. The project is the responsibility of the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority and Executive, and the latter has selected a private sector consortium, the GMA Group (a consortium of GEC, Mowlem, AMEC and Greater Manchester Buses), to design and build the system and to operate and maintain it for 15 years.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 162, Part II, written answers, cols 417-18; Department of Transport press notice, 24.10.89.

HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Government plans for the unified organisation of horticultural research and development (R & D) in England and Wales were announced in the House of Commons on 17 October by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Mr John Selwyn Gummer.

The activities of the Agricultural and Food Research Council (AFRC) and of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF), through its Agricultural Development and Advisory Service, are to be integrated under a reconstituted British Society for Horticultural Research, with an executive committee reporting to the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. The executive committee will include growers' representatives, and the new organisation will be able to receive funds directly from the MAFF, the AFRC and industry. It will operate the existing AFRC research centres at Wellesbourne, Warwickshire, and East Malling, Kent, as well as the AFRC centre for hop research at Ashford, Kent, and three MAFF experimental horticulture stations.

The new organisation will liaise closely with horticultural R & D establishments in Scotland, and the close integration of the British R & D programme will be maintained. Further consideration of the organisational arrangements in Scotland will take

place following the report of the committee of inquiry into the future of the Scottish Agricultural Colleges. Arrangements for horticultural R & D in Northern Ireland will be unchanged.

Sources: *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 155, written answers, col 97; MAFF press notice, 17.10.89.

COASTAL BATHING WATERS

Details of an investment programme costing some £1,100 million to bring British bathing waters up to European Community quality standards were given by the Minister for Housing and Planning, Mr Michael Howard, in the House of Commons on 20 October. Mr Howard said that details of the programme, designed to facilitate compliance by Britain with its obligations under the European Community Bathing Water Directive, had been sent by the Government to the European Commission on 4 October. In 1988, 67 per cent of bathing waters in England, Wales and Northern Ireland met the standards of the directive, compared with 55 per cent in 1987. Mr Howard said that by the mid-1990s about 95 per cent of bathing waters should meet the standards and that compliance should be completed within ten years.

In Scotland investment of £45·7 million is planned and in Northern Ireland £7 million. In England and Wales over £1,000 million of investment is planned by the new water and sewage companies, the successors to the regional water authorities under the Water Act 1989 (see pp 20-4 and 321-2):

South West Water plc	£312·5 million
Southern Water plc	£216·7 million
Anglian Water plc	£150·1 million
North West Water plc	£147·2 million
Welsh Water plc	£96·8 million
Northumbrian Water plc	£86·2 million
Yorkshire Water plc	£28·9 million
Wessex Water plc	£23·6 million

Source: *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 157, written answers, cols 261-2.

International Action against the Illicit Drugs Trade

The need for the United Nations to have one body to tackle all aspects of the illicit drugs trade was emphasised in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly on 2 November by the Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Mr Tim Sainsbury.

United Nations Role

Expressing Britain's concern that the United Nations drugs bodies were under-resourced and inadequately structured to enable the international community to deal with the problem, Mr Sainsbury stressed that international co-operation had to be strengthened. The United Nations had an essential role to play and was already performing valuable work. Britain had a high regard for, and was one of the major donors to, the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. It had also provided additional bilateral assistance to the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the Secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board.[1]

The efforts of these bodies, however, were not enough, and Britain welcomed recent proposals by Jamaica and Sweden designed to make the United Nations more effective. An essential prerequisite was to ensure that it had the appropriate resources and structure to take on new tasks. At present, the drugs bodies financed from the regular budget were under-resourced to carry out the increasing demands made upon them, even though Britain and other countries had provided extra-budgetary assistance. 'We need to decide what resources we are prepared to devote to this problem and ensure that they are allocated on a regular basis.'

The resources also had to be used in the most efficient way; the existence of three separate UN bodies devoted entirely to drugs work was an obsolete structure for handling an escalating international problem, leading to 'duplication of effort, lack of co-ordination and a waste of resources and expertise'. A single unified body was needed to tackle all aspects of the drugs problem. 'Unless a more unified approach is adopted, . . . the United Nations effort will continue to lack focus and therefore momentum.' It would also be necessary to ensure the co-ordination of other UN agencies involved in drugs work.

Supporting the Swedish proposal that the Secretary-General should convene a small task force of experts to develop a worldwide programme of action, Mr Sainsbury said that such a task force should study the various proposals for a strengthened UN role and make recommendations on a more effective and efficient structure.

Role of National Governments

The United Nations, however, could not be expected to solve all the problems regarding drugs. 'There is much to be done by national governments themselves to develop and build on the achievements of international co-operation.'

Governments, for instance, needed to make every effort to sign and ratify the 1988 UN Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (see p 15) and to negotiate agreements to trace, freeze and seize traffickers' assets (see p 244). The 1988 Convention contained important provisions on precursor chemicals, the producers of which had a key role to play in preventing their export for the illicit production of drugs. All countries had to ensure that, as required by the Convention, their monitoring mechanisms were effective and to establish new procedures if they were not.

In addition, more had to be done to reduce the demand for drugs. Britain, in association with the United Nations, would be hosting a world ministerial summit in London in April 1990 (see p 392), which would focus primarily on demand reduction. All UN members would be invited to attend and both the Colombian President and the UN Secretary-General had agreed to address the conference. The Government also hoped that the London summit would help to identify effective responses to the threat from cocaine and its derivative 'crack'.

[1] Between 1981 and 1988 Britain contributed $16·8 million to the Fund. The other two bodies are financed from the regular UN budget, and Britain has contributed £500,000 in additional bilateral assistance.

Social Security Benefits

The uprating of social security benefits was announced in October. The new rates, which will come into force in the week beginning 9 April 1990, the first full week in the tax year, reflect a rise in the retail price index of 7·6 per cent over the 12 months

to September 1989. As a result of the uprating, expenditure on social security, originally planned to be some £52,000 million in 1990-91, will rise by some £2,500 million. The Government has also announced a review of social security benefits for disabled people; proposals are expected to be announced before the end of the year.

Announcing the new benefit rates in the House of Commons on 25 October (*Hansard*, Vol 158, No 160, cols 841-69), the Secretary of State for Social Security, Mr Tony Newton, said that the proposed measures confirmed the capacity of the reformed benefit system (see pp 71-3, 1986) to focus more quickly and effectively on those with a special claim to help. The measures would reinforce government policies for care in the community and would underline the Government's commitment to ensuring that the country's increased prosperity was widely shared. In response to the series of national disability surveys undertaken by the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS – see p 337), said Mr Newton, the Government intended to bring forward before the end of the year proposals to improve the balance and structure of social security provision for long-term sick and disabled people and their relatives and carers.

The main points of Mr Newton's statement are as follows:

Pensions

The retirement pension for a married couple will rise from £69·80 a week to £75·10 and for a single person from £43·60 a week to £46·90. Public service pensions will be increased by the same percentage.

Unemployment Benefit

The basic rate of unemployment benefit will be increased from £34·70 to £37·35 for a single person and from £56·10 to £60·40 for a couple.

Benefits for Disabled People

Benefits payable to sick and disabled people, including sickness benefit, invalidity benefit, severe disablement allowance and invalid care allowance, will all rise by 7·6 per cent, as will attendance allowance and mobility allowance.

In the light of information gained from the OPCS surveys the Government intends to introduce a number of immediate improvements in the provision of disability benefits. Among others, these will include:

– introducing a carers' premium of £10 a week in income support for those receiving invalid care allowance;

– abolishing the rule preventing payment of attendance allowance for children aged under two years;

– extending mobility allowance to deaf-blind people;

– increasing from £12 to £20 a week the amount which those receiving invalid care allowance can earn without affecting their allowance; and

– making attendance allowance available to the terminally ill, without the normal six-month waiting period.

In addition, provision for the Independent Living Fund (which provides help to severely disabled people to help them live as independently as possible – see p 249, 1988), is being doubled from £5 million in 1988-89 to over £10 million in 1989-90, and will be further increased to more than £20 million in 1990-91. The total cost of these measures, in addition to the normal uprating of disability benefits, will be about £100 million a year. They are expected to improve the incomes of more than 500,000 seriously ill or disabled people and their carers.

Benefits for Children

In view of the particular need to target help on those who most need it – the less well-off pensioners, low-income families with children, and the long-term sick and disabled and their carers – it is proposed not to increase the rate of child benefit in April. As in the past two years, this will remain at £7·25 a week.

The Government, however, will be increasing the overall level of resources devoted to families with children, with the greatest emphasis being placed on those with the greatest needs. An extra £100 million will be spent on income support, family credit and housing benefits (see below). An additional £70 million will be spent on increasing child allowances. These measures are intended to help 1·5 million families and will in particular give greater encouragement to lone parents who wish to work.

Income-related Benefits

The income-related benefits – income support, housing benefit, community charge benefit and family credit – will also be increased by 7·6 per cent, less housing costs.

Among the most important changes proposed for elderly and disabled people is the increase in expenditure on those on income support who are in residential care or nursing homes. The income support limits will be increased by £10 a week for virtually every category of home, providing more help for 200,000 elderly and disabled people.

Main Contributory and Non-contributory Benefits

The payment of some benefits – such as retirement or widow's and invalidity pensions and sickness and unemployment benefit – depends on contributions paid under the National Insurance scheme. Other benefits do not depend upon contributions: the main one is child benefit, but there are also a number providing special help, for example, for disabled people.

	Existing weekly rate £	*Proposed weekly rate* £
Child benefit each child	7·25	7·25
One-parent benefit first or only child of certain lone persons	5·20	5·60
Retirement and widow's pensions and widowed mother's allowance single person	43·60	46·90

	Existing weekly rate £	Proposed weekly rate £
wife or other adult dependant	26·20	28·20
Invalidity pension		
single person	43·60	46·90
spouse or other adult dependant	26·20	28·20
Invalidity allowance		
higher rate	9·20	10·00
middle rate	5·80	6·20
lower rate	2·90	3·10
Unemployment benefit		
single person	34·70	37·35
wife or other adult dependant	21·40	23·05
Sickness benefit		
single person	33·20	35·70
wife or other adult dependant	20·55	22·10
Statutory sick pay		
earnings threshold	43·00	46·00
standard rate threshold	84·00	125·00
lower rate	36·25	39·25
standard rate	52·10	52·50
Widow's payment (lump sum)	1,000·00	1,000·00
Statutory maternity pay		
earnings threshold	43·00	46·00
lower rate	36·25	39·25
Maternity allowance	33·20	35·70
Attendance allowance		
higher rate	34·90	37·55
lower rate	23·30	25·05
Severe disablement allowance	26·20	28·20
Invalid care allowance	26·20	28·20
wife or other adult dependant	15·65	16·65
Mobility allowance	24·40	26·25
Guardian's allowance, child's special allowance	8·95	9·65
Rate of benefit for children of: widows; invalidity and retirement pensioners; invalid care beneficiaries; unemployment and sickness beneficiaries when claimant is over pension age	8·95	9·65

Industrial Injuries Benefits

Industrial injuries benefits are payable to employed people who suffer injuries caused by an accident at work or from a prescribed industrial disease. Disablement benefit is usually paid after a qualifying period of 15 weeks if there is a loss of physical or mental faculty. (During the qualifying period statutory sick pay or sickness benefit may be payable.)

	Existing weekly rate £	Proposed weekly rate £
Disablement benefit (100 per cent assessment)	71·20	76·60
unemployability supplement	43·60	46·90
reduced earnings allowance (maximum)	28·48	30·64
constant attendance allowance (normal maximum)	28·50	30·70
exceptionally severe disablement allowance	28·50	30·70
Industrial death benefit widow's pension		
higher permanent rate	43·60	46·90
lower permanent rate	13·08	14·07

Income-related Benefits

Entitlement to all income-related benefits is assessed using the same basic rules. There is a limit to the amount of capital a person may have and still be entitled, and income is taken into account net of income tax and National Insurance contributions.

Income Support, Housing Benefit and Community Charge Benefit

Income support is payable to families who are not in work and whose financial resources fall below certain levels. It consists of a basic allowance with additional premiums for families, lone parents, pensioners and long-term sick and disabled people. People whose income is no higher than certain specified levels receive housing benefit or community charge benefit equivalent to 100 per cent of their rent and 80 per cent of their rates or community charge (see p 245, 1988).

	Existing weekly rate £	Proposed weekly rate £
Personal Allowances		
single (income support)		
under age 18	20·80	21·90
age 18-24	27·40	28·80
age 25 or over	34·90	36·70
single (housing benefit)		
age 16-24	27·40	28·80
age 25 or over	34·90	36·70
single (community charge benefit)		
age 18 to 24	27·40	28·80
age 25 or over	34·90	36·70
lone parent (income support)		
under age 18	20·80	21·90
age 18 or over	34·90	36·70
lone parent (housing benefit)		
age under 18	27·40	28·80
age 18 or over	34·90	36·70
lone parent (community charge benefit)		
age 18 or over	34·90	36·70
couple (income support and housing benefit)		
both under age 18	41·60	43·80

	Existing weekly rate £	*Proposed weekly rate* £
at least one age 18 or over	54·80	57·60
couple (community charge benefit)		
one or both over age 18	54·80	57·60
dependent children		
under age 11	11·75	12·35
age 11-15	17·35	18·25
age 16-17	20·80	21·90
age 18	27·40	28·80
Premiums		
family	6·50	7·35
lone parent (income support)	3·90	4·10
lone parent (housing benefit)	8·60	9·70
lone parent (community charge benefit)	8·60	9·70
pensioner		
single	11·20	11·80
couple	17·05	17·95
pensioner (enhanced)		
single	13·70	14·40
couple	20·55	21·60
pensioner (higher)		
single	16·20	17·05
couple	23·00	24·25
maximum amounts (income support) for accommodation and meals in:		
residential care homes		
old age	140·00	150·00
very dependent elderly	155·00	165·00
mental disorder	140·00	150·00
drug/alcohol dependence	140·00	150·00
mental handicap	165·00	175·00
physical disablement		
under pension age	200·00	210·00
over pension age	140·00	150·00
others	140·00	150·00
nursing homes		
mental disorder	195·00	200·00
drug/alcohol dependence	190·00	200·00
mental handicap	205·00	215·00
terminal illness	235·00	245·00
physical disablement		
under pension age	235·00	245·00
over pension age	190·00	200·00
others (including elderly)	190·00	200·00
disability		
single	13·70	15·40
couple	19·50	22·10
severe disability		
single	26·20	28·20
couple (one disabled)	26·20	28·20
couple (both disabled)	52·40	56·40
disabled child	6·50	15·40
carers (from October 1990)	–	10·00

Family Credit

Family credit is payable to working families on modest incomes, with children. It is additional to child benefit and is related to net income, and to the number and ages of children in the family. Where the net income is no higher than £57·60 the following amounts are payable (the rate is reduced by 70 pence for each pound by which net income exceeds this amount):

	Existing weekly rate £	*Proposed weekly rate* £
Adult credit	33·60	36·35
Child credit		
under age 11	7·30	8·25
age 11-15	12·90	14·15
age 16-17	16·35	17·80
age 18	23·30	25·10

Social Fund

This is a system of discretionary payments, in the form of loans or grants, available to people on low incomes who have special or emergency needs.

Capital limit		
aged 60 or over	500·00	1,000·00

Main War Pensions

War pensions are payable for disablement or death as a result of service in the armed forces, or for certain injuries received in the merchant navy or civil defence during wartime, or to civilians injured by enemy action.

	Existing weekly rate £	*Proposed weekly rate* £
Disablement pension for a private at 100 per cent rate	71·20	76·60
Age allowance, depending on degree of disability	5·00-15·50	5·40-16·70
Unemployability allowances		
personal allowance	46·30	49·80
increase for wife or other adult dependant	26·20	28·20
increase for each child	8·95	9·65
Constant attendance allowance		
normal maximum	28·50	30·70
Comforts allowance		
higher rate	12·30	13·20
lower rate	6·15	6·60
Mobility supplement	27·10	29·15
Allowance for lowered standard of occupation (maximum)	28·48	30·64
Exceptionally severe disablement allowance	28·50	30·70
Severe disablement occupational allowance	14·25	15·35
Clothing allowance (annual rate)		
higher rate	97·00	104·00
lower rate	61·00	66·00
Widow's pension (private's widow)		
standard rate	56·65	60·95
childless widow under 40	13·08	14·07

	Existing weekly rate £	*Proposed weekly rate* £
Rent allowance (maximum)	21·55	23·20
Age allowance for elderly widows		
age 65-69	6·10	7·00
age 70-79	12·20	13·50
age 80 and over	15·30	20·00

Shorter Note

ENDANGERED SPECIES: THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT

The conference of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), held in October in Lausanne, Switzerland, decided to place the African elephant on Appendix I of the Convention, thereby introducing a ban on trade in new ivory. The Government had instituted a ban on imports of ivory into Britain in June and had proposed a similar ban throughout the European Community (see p 282), which had been implemented in August. Under the Convention, trade is not normally allowed in Indian elephant ivory, but limited trade in African ivory had been permitted while the African elephant was listed in Appendix II. During the last ten years the number of African elephants has declined by about 45 per cent.

Welcoming the conference's decision, the Minister for the Environment and Countryside, Mr David Trippier, noted that the Government had been successful in obtaining approval for a British resolution urging all party states to implement the Appendix I controls with immediate effect. Some African states had indicated their intention to enter reservations and Mr Trippier said that it was for the African governments concerned to work out a long-term conservation strategy to ensure the survival of the species, but the Government was 'always ready to consider any proposal from African countries for assistance with measures to conserve their populations of elephants'.

Explaining Britain's position on a vote about the future of the stocks of ivory held in Hong Kong (where there is a significant business in carving and trading in ivory), Mr Trippier said that the British delegation had abstained because of Britain's 'special position with regard to Hong Kong'. The Hong Kong delegates had been formally part of the British delegation, and the Government had ensured that they had an opportunity to present their case for the continued trading of their stocks. It had not, however, sought to influence the conference on their behalf. Now that the conference had agreed that the ban should also cover existing stocks of ivory, the Government would do its best to ensure that the ban was effective.

Source: *Hansard*, Vol 158, No 162, Part II, written answers, col 466.

DOCUMENTATION

Government and Administration

United Kingdom Government Ministers. COI, No 61/89/2.

Control of Immigration: Statistics United Kingdom 1988. Cm 726. HMSO, £11·80. ISBN 0 10 107262 7.

Criminal Statistics England and Wales 1988. Cm 847. HMSO, £16. ISBN 0 10 108472 3.

Criminal Law: Computer Misuse (see p 406). Cm 819. HMSO, £5·60. ISBN 0 10 108192 8.

Report on the Work of the Prison Service: April 1988–March 1989. Cm 835. HMSO, £10·90. ISBN 0 10 108352 1.

External Affairs and Defence

An Evolutionary Approach to Economic and Monetary Union (see pp 408-9). Available free from HM Treasury, Parliament Street, London SW1P 3AG.

Economic and Scientific Affairs

Key Data – 1989–90 Edition – UK Social and Business Statistics. Central Statistical Office. HMSO, £3·50. ISBN 0 11 620391 9.

80th Report of the Commissioners of HM Customs and Excise for the Year Ended 31 March 1989. Net receipts of taxes and duties amounted to about £49,700 million during the year, equal to some 41 per cent of central government tax revenue. Net receipts of value added tax were £27,300 million. Seizures of illegal drugs with an estimated street value of £200 million were made. Cm 780. HMSO, £8·60. ISBN 0 10 107802 1.

The Single Market: Financial Services. Department of Trade and Industry. Contains advice and information on the European Community directives affecting the financial services sector. Available free from the Department of Trade and Industry, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET.

Britain's Balance of Payments in 1988 (reproduced from the *Survey of Current Affairs*). COI, No 287/89.

Unofficial Action and the Law: Proposals to Reform the Law Affecting Unofficial Industrial Action (see p 425). Cm 821. Department of Employment. HMSO, £3. ISBN 0 10 108212 6.

People and Companies: Employee Involvement in Britain. Department of Employment. HMSO, £5. ISBN 0 11 361281 8.

Companies in 1988–89. Department of Trade and Industry. The annual report on British companies notes the incorporation of 135,000 companies and the deregistration of 117,000 during the year ended 31 March. Contains information on Companies House activities in the monitoring and provision of services to companies. HMSO, £12·50. ISBN 0 11 514671 7.

Insolvency General Annual Report 1988. Department of Trade and Industry. Records a decline during 1988 of 18 per cent in the number of companies in England and Wales going into liquidation, a decline of 14 per cent in the number of receiverships and an increase of 15 per cent in solvent liquidations compared with 1987. Individual insolvencies rose by 15 per cent in 1988. HMSO, £3·25. ISBN 0 11 514693 8.

Professional Liability: Report of the Study Teams. Department of Trade and Industry. A report on the nature, scope, extent and implications of professional liability problems. Based on studies conducted since 1987 of people's experiences of claiming damages for professional negligence. HMSO, £14·95. ISBN 0 11 515205 9.

A Collegiate System for Agriculture in Scotland: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Future of the Scottish Agricultural Colleges Appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland and the Chairman of the Scottish Agricultural Colleges (Ltd) under the Chairmanship of Sir Alwyn Williams. HMSO, £8·50. ISBN 0 11 494090 8.

Animal Health 1988: The Report of the Chief Veterinary Officer. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and

Food, and Scottish and Welsh Offices. HMSO, £12. ISBN 0 11 242865 7.

Food Poisoning: Listeria and Listeriosis. The Government's Response to the Sixth Report from theSocial Services Committee. Department of Health and Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. HMSO, £2·30. ISBN 0 10 108482 X.

The Severn Barrage Project: General Report (see p 431). Energy Paper No 57. Department of Energy, Central Electricity Generating Board, and Severn Tidal Power Group. HMSO, £13·95. ISBN 0 11 412952 5.

Harnessing the Wind: The Continuing Development of Wind Energy Technology in Britain. Available free from the Department of Energy, 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5HE.

Renewable Energy in Britain. Available free from the Department of Energy, 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5HE.

Investigation into the Clapham Junction Railway Accident (see p 426). Cm 820. Department of Transport. HMSO, £16·50. ISBN 0 10 108202 9.

United Kingdom Shipping Industry International Revenue and Expenditure 1988. Department of Transport. HMSO, £4·20. ISBN 0 11 550938 0.

Our Earth. Natural Environment Research Council. The latest in the Council's series of strategy and research documents, it outlines the Council's approach to Earth sciences, and stresses the relevance to mineral exploitation, natural hazard prediction and understanding of global climate change. Available free from the Natural Environment Research Council, Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon SN2 1EU. ISBN 1 85531 008 2.

Frontiers of Earth Sciences to the Year 2000: Research Priorities for the United Kingdom. A report to the Council of the Royal Society and the Natural Environment Research Council. The report identifies seven priority research areas for future solid-Earth science research in Britain. Available from Publications Sales Department, The Royal Society, 6 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5AG. £4·45. ISBN 1 85531 005 8.

Global Climate Change. A booklet explaining the principles of the problem of climate change, the scope of the threat and the possible options for responding to it. It was prepared by the Department of the Environment, in association with the Meteorological Office, as Britain's response to a resolution by European Community Environment Ministers, in June 1989, which called on member countries to take action to inform the public on the problems of climate change and the greenhouse effect. Available free from the Department of the Environment, Room A121, Romney House, 43 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3PY.

Social and Cultural Affairs

Women and Men in Britain 1989. A statistical review of the present position of women and men in Britain. Equal Opportunities Commission. HMSO, £5·90. ISBN 0 11 701444 3.

Education and Training: Working Paper 10. (One of a series of working papers issued by the Department of Health, and supplementary to the Government's White Paper *Working for Patients* – see p 120.) HMSO, £5·30. ISBN 0 11 321256 9.

Health and Personal Social Services Statistics for England: 1989 Edition. The chief annual statistical reference volume produced by the Department of Health. HMSO, £10·25. ISBN 0 11 321253 4.

Health in Scotland 1988. Annual report of the Chief Medical Officer for Scotland. HMSO, £7·70. ISBN 0 11 493518 1.

Aspects of Primary Education: The Teaching and Learning of History and Geography. Department of Education and Science. HMSO, £4·25. ISBN 0 11 270695 9.

Drama from 5 to 16. Curriculum Matters 17. An HMI Series. Department of Education and Science. HMSO, £2. ISBN 0 11 270691 6.

Environmental Assessment: A Guide to the Procedures. Department of the Environment. HMSO, £5·30. ISBN 0 11 752244 9.

Annual Report 1988–89 and Code of Practice. Broadcasting Standards Council. The Council's first annual report since its establishment in May 1988 (see pp 388–91, 1988), together with its code of practice for broadcasters, covering the portrayal of violence and sex and standards of taste and decency. Available free from the Broadcasting Standards Council, 5–8 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS. ISBN 1 872521 00 Z.

Supporting the Arts. A report, commissioned by the Government in December 1988 and prepared by Mr Richard Wilding, of a major review of the structure of support for the arts in England. Available from the Office of Arts and Libraries, Room 67D, Horse Guards Road, London SW1P 3AL. 60p.

National Heritage Memorial Fund. Annual Report 1989–89. Available from National Heritage Memorial Fund, 10 St James's Street, London SW1A 1EF. £6·50.

Historic Buildings Council for Scotland. Report for 1988–89. HMSO, £9. ISBN 0 10 257189 9.

Annual subscription including indices and postage £25.50 net
Dd 8844967 C7 NOVEMBER/1989
ISBN 0 11 728509 9 Vol. 19 No. 11
ISSN 0039—6214